

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

JAMES WILSON BRIGHT, Editor-in-Chief

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM

WILLIAM KURRELMMEYER

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

## CONTENTS

BEATTY, JOSEPH M., JR.—Garrick, Colman, and 'The Clandestine Marriage,'	129
SLOAN, ARTHUR S.—Juan de Luna's 'Lazarillo' and the French Translation of 1660,	141
PHELPS, RUTH S.—The Riming Clue in Dante,	144
DRAPER, JOHN W.—Queen Anne's Act: A Note on English Copyright,	146
MUSTARD, W. P.—Notes on Ben Jonson's 'Catiline,'	154
KUHL, E. P.—Chaucer and the "Fowle Ok,"	157
WILLIAMS, STANLEY T.—The Early Sentimental Dramas of Richard Cumberland,	160

### Reviews:—

J.-ROGER CHARBONNEL, <i>La Pensée italienne au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle et le courant libertin</i> . [John L. Gerig.]	166
ALBRECHT JANSSEN, <i>Die Frauen rings um Friedrich Hebbel. Neue Materialien zu ihrer Erkenntnis</i> . [T. M. Campbell.]	174
KARL YOUNG, <i>Ordo Rachelis</i> . [Grace Frank.]	180

### Correspondence:—

TUELL, ANNE K.—Note on Spenser's <i>Clarion</i> ,	182
HAMMOND, ELEANOR P.—The Lost Quires of a Shirley Codex,	184
WOODBIDGE, BENJ. M.—Maupassant's Version of <i>Les Dous Amans</i> ,	185
RAVEN, ANTON A.—A Note on <i>King Lear</i> ,	187

### Brief Mention:—

FREDERICK M. PADELFORD, <i>The Poems of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey</i> ;	188
W. F. SMITH, <i>Readings from Rabelais</i> ,	

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS  
BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year—Single Copy (Current) Sixty-five Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,  
Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION with inter-  
mission from July to October (inclusive)

This publication is devoted to linguistic and literary research and to æsthetic and philosophic criticism in the domain of English, German, and the related Germanic Languages; and of French, Italian, Spanish, and the other Languages of the Romance Group. Its purpose is also to promote sound methods in the teaching of the Modern Languages and Literatures

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is  
\$5.00 for the United States and Mexico; Canada \$5.25  
and \$5.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union.

Contributors and Publishers will please address matter for the English Department of the *Notes* to James W. Bright; for the German Department to William Kurrelmeyer; for the French Department to H. Carrington Lancaster; for the Italian and Spanish Departments to Gustav Gruenbaum. Other matter may be sent to the Editor-in-Chief. The address of all the editors is Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

## PREPARATION OF COPY

All copy should be in typewritten form.

Underscore (for italics) all titles of books, periodicals, poems, plays and other separately published compositions.

Use numerals in designating foot-notes, and number foot-notes in unbroken sequence.

Use roman numerals for volume-reference, set off by a comma before a following page-reference.

## New Oxford Books of Interest

**ENGLISH INTO FRENCH:** Five Thousand English Locutions rendered into Idiomatic French by D. N. SAMPSON. 1920. 8vo ( $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ ), pp. viii + 210.

By "locution" is meant a chain of words having the force of a single word, or, by extension, expressing a complete idea; the difficulty of finding the French equivalent in an English-French dictionary is considerable.

### OXFORD JUNIOR GERMAN SERIES

**SIEGFRIED**, nach Schalk's Deutschen Heldensagen, adapted and edited by A. E. WILSON and A. MEYRICK. 1920. Fcap 8vo ( $6\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ ), pp. 110, with questions, exercises, and a vocabulary. Limp cloth.

**DER GEISTERSEHER** von Friedrich von Schiller herausgegeben von R. A. COTTON. 1920. Fcap 8vo ( $6\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ ), pp. 95, with questions, exercises, short notes, and a vocabulary. Limp cloth.

**ROLAND UND BEOWULF:** Zwei Heldengeschichten, edited by H. E. G. TYNDALE. 1920. Fcap 8vo ( $6\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ ), pp. 96, with questions, exercises, short notes, and a vocabulary. Limp cloth.

The Oxford Junior German Series is the outcome of the favorable reception accorded the Oxford Junior French Series. There is unity of treatment in the Questionnaires, Grammatical Exercises, Notes and Vocabularies and both Questionnaires and Grammatical Exercises have been framed on simple lines, designed to elicit prompt and unstudied answers.

*Copies of the above for examination with  
a view to class use may be had on request*



OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

American Branch

35 WEST 32ND STREET, NEW YORK



# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

---

VOLUME XXXVI

MARCH, 1921

---

NUMBER 3

## GARRICK, COLMAN, AND *THE CLANDESTINE MARRIAGE*

With the exception of the plays of Goldsmith and Sheridan, *The Clandestine Marriage* was probably the best English comedy of the second half of the eighteenth century. Its authors were George Colman, the elder, and David Garrick, respectively one of the most widely known dramatists of his generation and one of the greatest actors that England has produced. The part each had in the writing of the play was in dispute even during their lives, and has remained in dispute until the present. It is my purpose to examine the evidence both internal and external that has any bearing upon the indebtedness of the play to each of its two authors, and to state the conclusions that can be drawn from such an examination.

Since much of the discussion will pre-suppose familiarity with the details of this now slightly known play, it will be advisable to give a brief account of the plot:

Fanny Sterling, the daughter of a rich city-merchant, has been clandestinely married to Lovewell, a worthy but impecunious kinsman of an amorous nobleman, Lord Ogleby. Sir John Melvil, a nephew of Lord Ogleby, and the lord himself accompanied by Canton, a Swiss valet, and Brush, another servant, arrive at the Sterling house to complete arrangements for Sir John's marriage with Miss Sterling, Fanny's elder sister. Unfortunately, Sir John, upon seeing Fanny, falls in love with her, and is discovered by the elder sister on his knees before her. The sister is naturally very indignant. Because of parental objection to Lovewell, it seems unwise to announce the marriage, even though Fanny is with child. Fanny and Lovewell decide that in order to warn Sir John, she should explain the whole affair to Lord Ogleby. While she is telling Lord

Ogleby the story, however, she is interrupted at a point which makes it seem to the lord that she is really in love with him. The denouement comes when Lovewell is discovered in Fanny's room. The whole situation is cleared satisfactorily for Fanny and her husband. Other characters are Mrs. Heidelberg, the vulgar widowed sister of Sterling, a chambermaid, several lawyers, and Betty, Fanny's maid and confidante.

The play was first produced at the Theatre-Royal in Drury Lane on February 20, 1766 ([Genest, J.,] *Some Account of the English Stage, from the Restoration in 1660 to 1830*. In ten volumes. Bath, 1832. vol. v, pp. 92-3). It was later printed as by George Colman and David Garrick, with the motto on the title-page,

*Huc adhibe vultus, et in unâ parce duobus:  
Vivat, et ejusdem simus uterque parens!*

It was reviewed in *The Critical Review*, vol. XXI, pp. 221-225.

The author of the article on *The Clandestine Marriage* in *Biographia Dramatica* makes certain remarkable statements about the respective parts of Colman and Garrick in the play. He says, "We have usually heard that Garrick's share of this piece was Lord Ogleby and the courtly family; and Colman's, Sterling and the city family. But the following was related to us by a gentleman who declared that it was from the mouth of Mr. Colman himself; 'Garrick composed two acts, which he sent to me, desiring me to *put them together*, or do what I would with them. I did put them together, for I put them into the fire, and wrote the play myself'" (*Biographia Dramatica; or a Companion to the Playhouse* . . . Originally compiled, to the year 1764, by David Erskine Baker, Continued thence to 1782, by Isaac Reed, F. A. S. And brought down to the End of November 1811 . . . by Stephen Jones. In 3 volumes. London, 1812. vol. II, p. 106). In the discussion of *False Concord*, a farce by the Rev. James Towneley, acted at Covent Garden, March 20, 1764, and not printed, it is noted that "It is worthy of remark, that in this farce were three characters (Lord Lavender, Mr. Sudley an enriched soap-boiler, and a pert valet) which were afterwards transplanted, with the dialogue of some scenes, nearly *verbatim*, into *The Clandestine Marriage* (brought out two years afterwards), under the names of Lord Ogleby, Mr. Sterling, and Brush" (*ib.* p. 218). This alleged fact was disclosed by "Mr. Roberdeau in his *Fugitive Verse and*

*Prose*, 1801; Mr. R. having married a daughter of the late Mr. Towneley" (*ib.*).

When George Colman, the younger, in 1820, published in London *Posthumous Letters from Various Celebrated Men; Addressed to Francis Colman, and George Colman, the Elder*, he did not allow such statements as these to pass unchallenged. In the *Addenda* to his volume he printed a defence of his father which included in his father's handwriting a document submitted to David Garrick apparently before the play was begun. In this document, Colman suggests numerous details concerning both characters and plot.

In his discussion of the characters, Colman first of all suggests that the Earl of Oldsap—to be played by Garrick—should be an old Lord who thinks every woman in love with him. Because of this belief he ogles at every woman he meets. Colman completes his remarks about the earl with this significant statement: "But this notion you are more fully possest of than I" (*Posthumous Letters*, p. 334). He then mentions as the other characters, Lord Sapplin, son of the Lord; Traffick, a rich city merchant, anxious to be thought "generous and genteel, w<sup>ch</sup> serves more effectually to expose his Bourgeoise manners"; Lovewell "privately married to Miss Bride—warm, and sensible" [it will be noted that Colman sometimes substitutes for the names of the characters the names of the actors who were to play the parts, J. M. B.]; "Mrs. Clive, Kennedy, or Bradshaw—Sister to Traffick—and something of the same character in Petticoats—only that he is rough & hearty in his manner, & she affects to be delicate & refined. Her dialect is particularly vulgar, aiming at the same time to be fine, not by murdering words in the slip-slop way, but by a mean twang in the pronunciation, as *Qualaty—famaly, &c*": "Miss Pope—eldest daughter to Traffick, a keen smart girl, full of spirit, sense, wit, humour, mischief, & malice": "Miss Bride—youngest daughter to Traffick,—a sensible girl, of a soft & amiable temper, not without proper spirit."

Turning from the characters, Colman proceeds to make a rough draught of the general scheme of the play: "A Treaty of Marriage is supposed to be set on foot between the Court and City Family, in w<sup>ch</sup> it is intended that Lord Sapplin, Garrick's Son, shall be married to Miss Pope, eldest daughter to Traffick; It

happens, however, that the young Lord has contracted a violent affection for Miss Bride, who is *before the beginning* of this play clandestinely married to Lovewell. The efforts made by Lord Sapplin to bring about his match with Miss Bride, instead of Miss Pope—the perplexities arising therefrom to the young Couple, Lovewell and Miss Bride—the growing jealousy, & malicious artifices of Miss Pope—& then naturally involving the old Earl (Garriek) in circumstances tending to shew his character—together with the part w<sup>ch</sup> Traffick & his Sister may naturally take in this affair—to make up the Story of the Play.”

Colman comments upon the fact that he is simply making a sketch of his plan, that his purpose is “merely to enable you to think in the same train with me: & that you may be still better acquainted with *the stuff of my thoughts*, I have here subjoined some loose hints of Acts, Scenes, manner of conducting the Story, of shewing the characters to advantage, &c” (*ib.* p. 336). He suggests that perhaps the plot might be still further “pleasantly embarrassed by introducing a character (a *good* one) openly intended to be married to Miss Bride.” The result of this plan he believes would be to make the situation of Lovewell and Miss Bride more difficult and would direct Miss Pope’s jealousy to the wrong object.

In quoting Colman’s hints for the Acts and Scenes, I shall italicize the details that were incorporated in the finished play. In Act I *he wishes to let the audience know* (1) *of the marriage* and (2) *of Lord Sapplin’s attachment to Bride instead of to his intended wife* [inserted in Act II]. He suggests that this will best be done and Lovewell will be raised somewhat above the others *if the latter is made a relative, perhaps nephew of the earl. Because of this relationship the young lord will the more naturally make him his confidant.* Furthermore, *the old earl could be shown dressing* [inserted in Act II], “& he might speak of himself—hold his son cheap as a man of gallantry—talk of what *he cd* do with the women—that even now all the family are more in love with him, &c, &c—a short lawyer scene (*à la Hogarth*) with some family-strokes on mortgages, settlements &c might perhaps be introduced [inserted in Act III]. If the City Family are at all produced in this Act, they may be supposed in expectation of the arrival of the Lords—Preparations making on all hands—Traffick

*talking of his venison, turbot, pine-apples, &c. His sister on tenterhooks to receive persons of family & Miss Pope's Elevation & Pride abt her noble match, & contempt of her sister—&c*" (*ib.* p. 338).

For Act II, Colman suggests that *the Lords should have arrived between Acts I and II*, and that in Act II, Scene I, Oldsap be shown with the women. *A humorous scene might be produced by having Traffick show his garden and remark upon the modern improvements in it.* Colman says, "You will not find many materials for this in yr own garden at Hampton; but you may among yr neighbors." *Lord Sapplin might find a chance to make a declaration to Miss Bride—she will speak of the indelicacy of his transferring his attentions to her, and will not encourage him. Miss Pope is to be aroused to jealousy by some incident and will then become incensed against both Lord Sapplin and her sister.*

At the beginning of his remarks upon Act III, Colman says, "N. B. Though I mark the acts thus, I by no means wd suggest to you that I have here planned out anything like the form of the business of the Play" (*ib.* p. 339). He suggests that *Lovewell and Miss Bride shall decide that since Lord Oldsap apparently has taken a kindly interest in her, she should tell him of Lord Sapplin's attentions and also of her marriage. While she is telling the first part, she becomes embarrassed, and leaving without a full confession, leads him to think when she says her affections are elsewhere, that she is in love with him. Miss Pope may complain to him of Lord Sapplin and Miss Bride, but in that case Lord Oldsap will deny this and say he can tell her where Miss Bride's affections are placed. Colman believes that if the character intended to be married to Miss Bride were now introduced, he might be used as a tool by Miss Pope if she should tell him of the wrong that was being planned against her, and should ask him to counteract the plot. Miss Bride and Lovewell agree that Lovewell shall now tell Lord Oldsap of the marriage, but before he can get fully under way, Lord Oldsap confesses his love for Miss Bride. Lord Oldsap is to break the whole matter to the family, by speaking to Traffick's sister, who first thinks he is making love to her. When she finds she is mistaken, she treats him with contempt.*

Colman ends his paper by remarking, "Of the Denouement I have not as yet even conceived those imperfect ideas I have got of

some other parts. Think of the whole, & think in my train, if it appears worth while, & when you have thrown y<sup>r</sup> thoughts on paper, as I have done mine, we will lay our heads together, Brother Bayes."

The younger Colman believed that it was after a consultation with Garrick that his father wrote the latter part of the following Loose Hints of Act V:

"Scene of Sterling, Ogleby, lawyers &c on filling up blanks, & settling all the clauses of the settlement—disputes arise, & Sterling ag<sup>st</sup> both matches, declaring that he will not marry his family into a Chancery suit—in the midst of their disputes enter Miss Sterling laughing immoderately, & brings in Betty trembling, who, being *interrogated* discovers the whole of the Clandestine Marriage.

#### V.

"Lovewell, & Fanny, & Betty in Fanny's apartment—Betty may tell them that M<sup>rs</sup> Lettice has been pumping her—Lovewell tells Fanny that finding the misconstruction of Ld. O., he was just on the point of explanation when Sir John appeared—but that he will certainly break it the next morning to Sir John—& this night shall conclude her anxieties on the clandestine marriage—(sc. 2). Another apartment, Miss Sterling & M<sup>rs</sup> H. in their night-cloaths [sic]—to them Lettice, who tells them she has been on the watch, & saw a man go into Miss Fanny's room—They immediately conclude it to be Sir John—& Miss Sterling resolves to expose her sister & Sir John—the family alarmed—various night figures—Betty brought in trembling, who discovers the whole affair—then Lovewell & at length Fanny, who being pardoned, Sir John's match breaks off, & the piece concludes by Sterling & Ogleby both joining in good humour about Fanny & Lovewell" (*ib.* pp. 343-4).

From even a most casual comparison of the completed play with the notes sent by Colman to Garrick, it is evident that whichever author wrote the first three acts, Colman was responsible for the early part of the plot in almost every respect. In Act I, Fanny and Betty let the audience into the secret at once. Lovewell is made a kinsman of Lord Ogleby. The Sterling family is preparing to receive the distinguished guests. Sterling, as pre-arranged, discusses the food for his dinner: "But, pray, sister Heidelberg, let the turtle be drest to-morrow, and some venison; and let the gardener cut some pine-apples, and get out some ice. I'll answer for wine, I warrant you: I'll give them such a glass of Champagne as they never drank in their lives; no, not at a duke's

table" (*The Dramatick [sic] Works of George Colman*. In four volumes, London, 1777. Vol. I, p. 179).

The characters of Mrs. Heidelberg, Miss Sterling, and Lord Ogleby as elaborated in Act I and the following acts are simply amplifications of Colman's notes. When Mrs. Heidelberg speaks to the housekeeper, Mrs. Trusty, about the anticipated arrival of the guests, she says, "Oh, here, Trusty; do you know that people of qualaty are expected this evening?" (*ib.* p. 175). Or, again, she says to Fanny, "Go, child! you know the qualaty will be here by and by; go, and make yourself a little more fit to be seen [*exit Fanny*]. She is gone away in tears; absolutely crying, I vow and pertest. This ridicalous love! We must put a stop to it. It makes a perfect nataral of the girl" (*ib.* p. 177). Miss Sterling, thinking of her marriage with Sir John, makes her sister exceedingly uncomfortable: "My heart goes pit-a-pat at the very idea of being introduced at court: gilt chariot! pye-balled horses! laced liveries! and then the whispers buzzing round the circle! Who is she? 'Lady Melvil, Ma'am!' Lady Melvil! my ears tingle at the sound . . . if Mr Lovewell and you come together, as I doubt not you will, you will live very comfortably, I dare say . . . perhaps I may meet you in the summer with some other citizens at Tunbridge. For my part, I shall always entertain a proper regard for my relations: You shan't want my countenance, I assure you" (*ib.* pp. 174-5). Miss Sterling's characterization of Ogleby is even more strikingly like Colman's notes: "He is full of attention to the ladies, and smiles, and grins, and leers, and ogles, and fills every wrinkle in his old wizen face with comical expressions of tenderness. I think he would make an admirable sweetheart" (*ib.* pp. 178-9).

The only suggestions not utilized in this act are those of having a lawyer-scene and of showing the old earl dressing. It is interesting, however, that the former is used in Act III and the latter in Act II. The arrival of the lord's servant at the end of Act I prepares for the arrival of the guests between acts as suggested by Colmán.

At the beginning of Act II the original plan was modified by the introduction of a servant-scene in Lord Ogleby's ante-chamber, followed by the appearance of the lord himself. The plan is further modified by Sir John's telling Lovewell that upon visiting his room early in the morning he had found it empty. This scene,

as anticipatory to Act V was in all probability suggested by Garrick. After the garden-scene, Sir John admits to Lovewell his love for Fanny, and failing to induce Lovewell to convey a letter to her from him, was in the act of declaring his love to Fanny herself when Miss Sterling discovered him. This scene gave the occasion that Colman desired to arouse Miss Sterling to jealousy.

The lawyer-scene suggested for Act I was inserted in Act III. Mrs. Heidelberg was made a more prominent figure by emphasizing the power she wielded in the family by reason of her money. The relations between Mrs. Heidelberg and the others in the group take up most of this act.

The suggestions made by Colman for Act III, in regard to the complications among Fanny, Lovewell, and Lord Ogleby were followed finally in Act IV, and carried out to the letter. The matter is further complicated by the request that Lord Ogleby makes to Sterling for his daughter's hand.

It is noteworthy that the first suggestions for Act V were not used, except in part for Act IV, and that the last suggestions were followed in the main. The order of disclosure was altered somewhat, however. Betty came out of Fanny's room first, but did not confess. She was followed by Fanny and finally by Lovewell.

From a survey of the internal evidence it is apparent, therefore, that Colman was responsible for the basic characterization of most of the chief *dramatis personae*, including Lord Ogleby, and also for the most important details of the first four acts. For more specific information we must turn to external evidence.

George Colman, the younger, suggests the method which his father and Garrick followed in their collaboration: "The probable process was, that they consulted, first, as to the general plan, and, secondly, as to the conduct of the incidents and scenes; then wrote *separately* and then compared and modified, *together*, what each had composed" (*Posthumous Letters*, p. 333). He states, furthermore, that his father had told him Garrick did not write all of Lord Ogleby, that, for instance, Colman wrote the whole of Lord Ogleby's first scene. This evidence is important, as coming from Colman's son, but his last statement, as we shall see later, is controverted by one of his father's own letters.

The elder Colman's letters from Garrick give considerable information in regard to the progress of the play and the methods of

collaboration. *The Clandestine Marriage* was apparently well under way as early as 1763, for in December of that year Garrick wrote from Naples to Colman, "I have not yet written a word of the fourth or fifth acts of 'The Clandestine Marriage,' but I am thinking much about it" (Peake, R. B., *Memoirs of the Colman Family, including their Correspondence with the most distinguished Personages of their time*. In two volumes. London, 1841, vol. I, p. 93). This reference would place the date of Colman's notes at least three months before the first production of *False Concord* on March 20, 1764, and should dispose of the charge of plagiarism as far as the conception of Lord Ogleby is concerned. It is also significant that Garrick was abroad at the time of the first production of *False Concord*. He wrote to Colman from Rome, April 11, 1764, a very intimate letter in which he said about *The Clandestine Marriage*, "Speed your plough, my dear friend; have you thought of 'The Clandestine Marriage'? I am at it" (*ib.* p. 102). Since Garrick continued abroad during 1764, it is improbable that his part of the play could have been plagiarized. Furthermore, it is probable that had any great part of it been filched from another work, the borrowing would have been exposed at once instead of a half-century later. In a letter from Paris, dated November 10, 1764, Garrick says, "Did you receive my letter about our Comedy? I shall begin, the first moment I find my comic ideas return to me, to divert myself with scribbling; say something to me upon that subject. I have considered our three acts, and with some little alterations they will do; I will ensure them" (*ib.* p. 126).

If we may judge from these letters and from the length of time that elapsed between the inception and completion of the play, it would seem probable that neither author was burningly enthusiastic about his task. By September 24, 1765, however, the work was nearing an end. On that date, Doctor Hoadly, in a letter to Garrick, says, "I am pleased to hear that Mr. Colman's Comedy, two acts of which you shewed me at Hampton some years ago, is in such forwardness, as I found, by his talk at his own house last winter that he had not worked any farther upon it; I did not let him know I had seen any part of it, or was privy to the scheme, which surely is a good one. God bless you both" (*ib.* pp. 156-7).

From the beginning, it would seem that Colman expected Garrick to play the part of Lord Ogleby. For some reason, how-

ever, when the play was completed, the great actor refused to undertake the part. Thomas Davies, Garrick's friend and biographer, attributed his change of mind to his advanced age and his frequent attacks of the gout and stone (Davies, T., *Memoirs of the Life of David Garrick, Esq.* . . . a new Edition in two volumes. London, 1808, vol. II, p. 102). Tate Wilkinson, the actor, said that Garrick wrote the part of Lord Ogleby before he went to Italy. When he returned, he decided not to play that part, both because of his health and also because, "if he himself should play Lord Ogleby, it would lead into applications from authors to request his performing in their pieces; to prevent which, he had come to a determination not to study any new character whatever, and desired Mr. King would do the part" (Wilkinson, T., *Memoirs of his Own Life*. In four volumes, York, 1790, vol. III, p. 254). At first King would not take the rôle, but he was at last persuaded. When he recited part of a scene to Garrick in a tremulous voice, "Garrick was all astonished, and thundered out, 'By G—d, King, if you can but sustain that fictitious manner and voice throughout, it will be one of the greatest performances that ever adorned a British theatre'" (*ib.* p. 255). Peake, the biographer of the Colmans, says that Garrick was unwilling to study a new part, and hints that it may have been because of a resemblance between Lord Ogleby and Lord Chalkstone in Garrick's own play, *Lethe*. He suspects that a meddler carried to Garrick some remarks made by Colman upon his collaborator as a manager (Peake, *op. cit.* vol. I, p. 157).

Whatever was the cause of Garrick's refusal to play the part of Lord Ogleby, his failure to fulfill Colman's expectations brought about a break between the two friends. On November 9, 1765, James Clutterbuck, writing to Garrick, says,

Colman and you are men of most quick sensations, and are apt sometimes to catch at words instead of things, and those very words may probably receive great alterations by the medium through which they pass. I know you love one another, and a third person might call up such explanations as would satisfy ye both; I myself should not doubt being able to do it were we assembled together. He had communicated his griefs (but no acrimony, I assure you) before your letters came and I commiserate his disappointment. Had I not been in the secret of the joint enterprise I suppose he would not have opened his mouth to me; but being so, the comedy

was read to my Molly and me last Wednesday night, and our concern, for that it is not likely to be finished and represented, equalled the delight we had in hearing the piece: I cannot help thinking there is but one person in the world capable of playing Lord Ogleby, *et hinc illae Lachrymae!* but who can help it?" (*The Private Correspondence of David Garrick with the Most Celebrated Persons of his Time*; . . . In two volumes. London, 1831, vol. I, pp. 206-7).

The most interesting evidence both in regard to this quarrel and in regard to the authorship of *The Clandestine Marriage* is to be found in a letter written by Colman to Garrick, December 4, 1765. It corroborates in every detail the conclusions drawn from the play itself:

Since my return from Bath I have been told, but I can hardly believe it, that, in speaking of 'The Clandestine Marriage,' you have gone so far as to say, 'Colman lays a great stress on his having written this character on purpose for me, suppose it should come out that *I wrote it!*' That the truth should come out is my earnest desire; but I should be extremely sorry, for your sake, that it should come out by such a declaration from you. Of all men in the world, I believe I may venture to say that I should be one of the last to take any thing to myself of which I was not the author . . . but you know that it was not I, but yourself, who desired secrecy in relation to our partnership, and you may remember the reasons you gave for it. You know, too, that on the publication of the play the whole affair was to come out, and that both our names were to appear together on the title-page. . . . In your letter to Clutterbuck . . . you tell him, 'that you had formed a plan of a comedy called *The Sisters*; that if the piece did not succeed, you had promised to take your part, with the shame that might belong to it, to yourself.' I cannot quote the words of your letter, but I am sure I have not misrepresented the purport of it, though the whole is diametrically opposite to my notion of the state of the partnership subsisting between us. You have the plan of 'The Sisters' by you; read it, and see if there are in it any traces of the story of 'The Clandestine Marriage.' You returned me the rough draught which I drew out of that story, and thinking it might be of use in conducting the plot I happened to preserve it: let them be compared, and see what is the resemblance between them. The first plate of Hogarth's 'Marriage à la Mode' was the ground I went upon: I had long wished to see those characters on the stage, and mentioned them as proper objects of comedy, before I had the pleasure of your acquaintance, in a letter written expressly in your defence against the attacks of your old arch enemy Shirley. . . . I understood it was to be a joint work, in the fullest sense of the

word; and never imagined that either of us was to lay his finger on a particular scene, and cry, 'This is mine!' It is true, indeed, that by your suggestion, Hogarth's proud lord was converted into Lord Ogleby, and that, as the play now stands, the levee-scene, at the beginning of the second act, and the whole of the fifth act, are yours: but in the conduct as well as dialogue of the fourth act, I think your favourite, Lord Ogleby, has some obligations to me" (*The Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, vol. I, pp. 209-210).

In Garrick's reply to this letter there is no attempt to deny Colman's assertions. Soon, however, the quarrel was over. On the one hand, the actor was able to prove to Colman's satisfaction that he had not intended to injure him; on the other hand, Colman was reconciled to the thought of having King take the part of Lord Ogleby. In less than three months after this letter was written, the play was on the stage.

From an examination of the preceding evidence certain facts are clear. In the first place, the story that Colman burned Garrick's manuscript is absurd. There is absolutely no indication of friction between the men before the play was finished. Had Colman been guilty of such an outrage there would undoubtedly have been some mention of it in their correspondence. In the next place, as has been suggested, the charge of plagiarism falls to the ground (1) because Garrick was not in London during the production of *False Concord* (2) because Colman's plans for the play were conceived before *False Concord* was produced, and (3) because contemporary writers were silent in regard to any hint of plagiarism.

In regard to the play itself it is evident that the draft which has been quoted and that mentioned in Colman's letter of December 4, 1765, are one and the same, and that the conception of *The Clandestine Marriage* as a whole must be credited to Colman. The characters, also, with the exception of the Swiss valet, Canton, and his comrade Brush, owe their individuality largely to him.

The evidence all points toward Garrick's authorship of Act V and the levee-scene in Act II. If he was the author of these portions of the play, it is probable that he was at least largely concerned in the other scenes where Ogleby and Canton appear. Their dialogue is so distinctive and so unvarying that it could not well have been written by two hands. Apparently Garrick had more share in writing Act IV than he had had in writing the

preceding acts, but it is clear from the letter of December 4 and a comparison of the play with the draft, that Colman should be given credit for much of the ground-work. Because of its connection with Act V, we may assume that the scene in which Melvil rallies Lovewell for his nocturnal wanderings is due largely to Garrick.

Further than this we cannot go. It would not be safe to assume that every departure from Colman's early plan is traceable to the superior stagemanship of Garrick. Act V, it is true, is the best act in the play, but Garrick was always at his best in short flights. Unlike Colman, he had not written any long original plays: he delighted in sketches, in re-workings, in short adaptations. Yet in spite of these facts, in those portions of the play where there has been a definite shifting of scenes for dramatic effect, it is probable that Garrick's brain, if not his pen, was the determining factor in the change.

JOSEPH M. BEATTY, JR.

Goucher College.

---

#### JUAN DE LUNA'S LAZARILLO AND THE FRENCH TRANSLATION OF 1660

In Dr. Chandler's bibliography of romances of roguery, he cites among the early editions in French of the *Lazarillo de Tormes* one dated "1660, Paris, Cotinet (Luna's)."<sup>1</sup> The title-page of this edition reads: LA VIDA DEL (sic) LAZARILLO DE TORMES, y de sus fortunas y adversidades. LA VIE DE LAZARILLE DE TORMES, Et de ses infortunes & aduersitez. Reueuë & corrigée par H. DE LUNE, natif de Castille, Interprete de la Langue Espagnolle. Et traduite en François par L. S. D. A Paris, Chez ARNOVD COTINET, rue des Carmes, au petit Jesus. MDCLX.

The Spanish text, which, according to the title-page, purports to be Luna's emended version of 1620, is printed on the left-hand pages of the book, the French rendering appearing opposite, on the right-hand pages. That the Spanish text as it appears here is the original from which the French translation was made is evident from the exactness with which the two correspond. But

<sup>1</sup>F. W. Chandler, *Romances of Roguery*, New York, 1899, part I, p. 406.

that it is not, in Part I, the text of Juan de Luna's version, the following comparison will show. Out of a large number of discrepancies, a few of the most striking selected from the first pages of *Tractado Primero*, are here set forth.

## TEXT OF 1660 EDITION

Cuenta el Lazaro su vida y quien era su padre. (Sub-title.)

Pues sepa V.M. ante todas cosas, que (p. 10).

...los llama bienaventurados (sic) (p. 12).

...metiase a guisar (p. 14) (AN).

...y limpiaba la ropa (p. 14).

...ella y un hombre Moreno (p. 14).

...aquillos (sic) que las bestias curauan (p. 14).

...vinieron en conocimiento. (p. 14).

...entraua se en la casa. (p. 14).

Yo al principio de su entrada pesaua me con el, y auia le miedo viendo el color y mal gesto que tenia: (p. 14).

...mas de que vi que (p. 14).

...mi madre vinose a darme (p. 14).

...huya del con miedo para mi madre (p. 16).

Respondiendo el riendo, (p. 16).

... (que assi se llamaua) (p. 16).

...: y hecha pesquisa (sic) (p. 16).

...porque el vno hurra (sic) de los pobres (p. 18).

...y para ayuda de otro tanto (p. 18).

...como niño respondia y descubria quanto sabia con miedo; (p. 18).

...servir a los que al presente biuian en el meson (p. 18).

(No chapter division.) (p. 20).

## TEXT OF LUNA'S EDITION

En que Lazaro cuenta cuyo hijo fue.

(Omitted.)

...llama a los tales bienaventurados.

...pusose a guisar

...y a labar la ropa

...ella y un negro

...los que en la cauallerica seruian

...trauaro (sic) estrecha amistad.

(Omitted.)

...al principio pesaua me dello por el miedo que del tenia viendo su color, y mal gesto:

...mas quando vi que

...mi madre me dio

...huya del de miedo y temor

...: el riendo le llamo

...que assi se llamaua el negro

...y hecha pesquisa del caso

...si vno hurta a los pobres

(Omitted.)

...como niño con el miedo descubria, quanto sabia

...servir al meson

CAP. SEGUNDO Como Lazaro se puso a servir, y a destrar vn ciego.

...ella me encomendo a el (p. 20).	...ella sin dificultad me puso con el
...que ella confiaua en: Dios (p. 20).	...que confiaua en Dios
...me <i>tratasse</i> bien (p. 20). (AN.)	...me <i>tratasse</i> bien
...pareciendole a mi amo (p. 20).	...donde pareciendole
...a su contento (p. 20).	...segun su deseo
...y ambos llorando (p. 20, 22).	...que llorando con mi
Y assi me fuy para mi amo, que esperandome estaua. (p. 22).	...Y assi me fuy a donde mi amo esperandome estaua.
...y llegando a la puente, esta a la entrada della un animal (p. 22).	...a la entrada de cuya puente esta un animal
Y el ciego mando me que legasse cerca del animal y alli puesto me dixo: (p. 22).	Y mandome el ciego llegase cerca del, y haziendo lo, me dixo:

The italics in the foregoing quotations are points at which a slight difference is noted between the Spanish text given by L. S. D. and the text of the first edition as restored by M. Foulché-Delbosc.<sup>2</sup> Five or six more of the same kind, mostly differences of spelling, are to be found in the pages from which these quotations are taken. But, with these exceptions, the text corresponds exactly with that of Foulché-Delbosc. On the other hand, these thirty quotations, taken from the first seven pages only of the translator's text, can be multiplied many times in the rest of Part I, and show so great a variance as to make it evident that the translator did not use Juan de Luna's version.

The text under consideration shows the following further differences from the Luna text: The Prologue is entirely wanting; and the chapter divisions and sub-titles peculiar to the Luna version are all omitted. The chapter on Lazaro's friendship with certain Germans, which forms the concluding chapter of nearly all the editions of the original text from 1561 on, is also the last chapter of Part I of this edition.

Part II of the translated text is undoubtedly Juan de Luna's. It may be this that accounts for his name on the title-page.

ARTHUR ST. CLAIR SLOAN.

*The Ohio State University.*

<sup>2</sup> *La Vida de Lazarillo de Tormes, Restitución de la edición príncipe*, por R. Foulché-Delbosc, Madrid, 1900.

## THE RIMING CLUE IN DANTE

It is well known that here and there in the *Divine Comedy*, tho not with the invariability and symmetry usually characteristic of his technique, Dante's love of symbolism and double significance has moulded even his rime. The most familiar instance of this, no doubt, is the word *Cristò*, which, on the four occasions of its occurrence as the rime-word, is permitted to rime only with itself.<sup>1</sup> Then there are the two pairs of passages, noted by Professor Grandgent in his edition of the *Divina Commedia*, in which likeness of rime draws our attention to similarity of sense: the rimes in *-uri* which connect the blasphemers Vanni Fucci of *Inferno*, xxv,<sup>2</sup> and Capaneus of *Inferno*, xiv,<sup>3</sup> and those in *-eda* which relate the prophecy in *Purgatorio*, xx,<sup>4</sup> to the one in *Purgatorio*, xxxiii.<sup>5</sup>

In addition to these, we may note a connection between the *maledetto lupo* riming with *cupo*, addressed to Plutus as representative of Avarice in the Fourth Circle of the *Inferno*,<sup>6</sup> and the *maledetta . . . lupa* riming with *cupa*, likewise addressed to Avarice on the Fifth Shelf of Purgatory;<sup>7</sup> and it is to be observed that these latter lines alternate precisely with those ending in *-eda* already cited from *Purgatorio*, xx. There is also the singular repetition of the two rime-words *tarda* and *riguarda* used with *Piccarda* in *Purgatorio*, xxiv,<sup>8</sup> which we find in the other passage in which the name of Forese's good and beautiful sister falls upon the rime.<sup>9</sup>

And since there is so little in Dante that comes by chance, it may even not be meticulous to remark the number of times that these rime-clues, if it be not overbold to call them such, occupy the same respective lines in different cantos: thus in *Purgatorio*, xx, and *Inferno*, xxv, the verses involved are 11-13-15; in *Inferno*, vii,

<sup>1</sup> *Par.*, xii, 71-73-75; xiv, 104-106-108; xix, 104-106-198; xix, 104-106-198; xxxii, 83-85-87.

<sup>2</sup> *Inf.*, xxv, 11-13-15.

<sup>3</sup> *Purg.*, xx, 11-13-15.

<sup>4</sup> *Inf.*, vii, 8-10-12.

<sup>5</sup> *Purg.*, xxiv, 8-10-12.

<sup>6</sup> *Inf.*, xiv, 44-46-48.

<sup>7</sup> *Purg.*, xxxiii, 35-37-39.

<sup>8</sup> *Purg.*, xx, 8-10-12.

<sup>9</sup> *Par.*, iii, 47-49-51.

and *Purgatorio*, xx and xxiv, 8-10-12; and in *Paradiso*, xiv and xix, 104-106-108. In only two cases, however, does this identity of line-numbers occur in any couple of parallel passages supposed to be so connected with each other; that is, in the last two mentioned, which are two of the four *Cristo* passages, and in the *lupa-lupa* pair.

Although there are several sets of evidently associated passages where there is no such clue to be found in the rimes, still these instances suggest that in the attempt to establish another such association, a similarity in the rime-scheme would contribute a small bit of supporting evidence. This has apparently been overlooked by Mr. J. C. Carroll in developing his interesting hypothesis that the *donna santa e presta* who prompts Virgil to dispel the vision of the Siren on the Shelf of Sloth<sup>10</sup> (usually identified with the *virtù che consiglia* of the preceding canto<sup>11</sup>), is none other than Matelda, the girlish genius of the Earthly Paradise, whose cheerful innocent activity is the best weapon against that melancholia or neurasthenia which is Sloth, as well as against the sins of the flesh typified by the Siren. Mr. Carroll's statement of his theory is as follows:<sup>12</sup>

As symbol of the Active Life, it would be natural that she should rebuke this sin of Sloth, and the sins she leads to. In his picture of her in the Earthly Paradise, Dante seems to contrast her, point by point, with the deformed faculties and members of the other. Her tongue is singing *Delectasti*. Venus herself could not outshine the light of her "honest eyes." He remembers her feet and the movements of them, as of a lady in a dance. Her hands were picking flowers; and her colour was that of "one who warms herself in rays of love." One by one the stammering tongue and eyes askint, the distorted feet and maimed hands and pallid colour are reversed, as if intentionally. And finally, it is surely strong corroboration of this view that the very word "alert" (*presta*) . . . is expressly applied to Matelda.<sup>13</sup>

What Mr. Carroll has omitted to note is that the word *presta* actually falls upon the rime in both passages, so that the linking rime in *-esta*,<sup>14</sup> marking another of such pairs of associated

<sup>10</sup> *Purg.*, xix, 26.

<sup>11</sup> *Purg.*, xviii, 62.

<sup>12</sup> John S. Carroll, *Prisoners of Hope, an Exposition of Dante's Purgatory*, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1906, p. 251.

<sup>13</sup> *Purg.*, xxviii, 83.

<sup>14</sup> *Purg.*, xix, 26-28-30, and xxviii, 83-85-87.

passages, is perhaps a further corroboration of his theory. And the curious may still further observe that the second set of *presta* rimes occupies the same respective lines in the canto (83-85-87) as does the last set of *Cristo* rimes,<sup>15</sup> thus making another small link in the delicate chain.

RUTH SHEPARD PHELPS.

*University of Minnesota.*

---

#### QUEEN ANNE'S ACT: A NOTE ON ENGLISH COPYRIGHT

Throughout most of the Seventeenth Century, the Stationers' Company of London held a virtual monopoly of the book-trade by controlling practically all of the licensed presses. Copyright consisted of entry in their *Register*; only a member of the company might enter a book; and the object was to protect, not the author, but the printer who, by virtue of this entry, "owned" the copyright. An author could get protection only, as did Wither, by a special grant of letters patent from the crown. Thus, in due course, various members of the "Worshipful Company" had become the "proprietors" in perpetuity of most of the English classics—not to mention Homer, Virgil and Horace—and bought and sold rights and shares which they had commonly obtained without either paying the author or getting his consent. In 1694, however, the Licensing Act of Charles II finally expired; and, from that time, the guild had to defend its privileges, not through a monopoly of presses, but through a monopoly of publishing, enforced by a refusal to sell works not properly entered under the name of one or more of the Company's numbers. This method was fairly effective; but what the booksellers really wanted was an Act of Parliament to give legal finality to their case. In 1703, 1706, and 1709, they petitioned for a bill; and the final result was the famous Copyright Act of Queen Anne (8 Anne c 19/5). Swift is supposed to have made the original draft; and the title suggests that it was not quite what the booksellers themselves would have drawn up: *An Act for the Encouragement of Learning by Vesting Copies of Printed Books in the Authors*. Any one might,

<sup>15</sup> *Purg.*, xxviii, 83-85-87, and *Par.*, xxxii, 83-85-87.

without fee, copyright an original book; but nine copies had to be given, one to the King's Library, one to the Stationers Company, one to Sion College, and one to each of the two English and the four Scotch universities. These copies had to be delivered under rather light penalties; and, in case of failure to comply, prosecution had to begin *within three months*. The copyright was vested in the author or his assigns for fourteen years with the right of extension to twenty-eight.<sup>1</sup>

This law took from the booksellers the old monopoly of registry, placed upon them the burden of dispensing nine copies of each book *gratis*, and, in return, gave them no protection. Their consequent evasion of it is eloquently set forth in an obscure tract attributed to Edmund Law, Bishop of Carlyle<sup>2</sup>:

Under this act, very few books of value have been obtained [by Cambridge University], the Booksellers being determined not to lose so many Copies of the largest Paper,<sup>3</sup> as this Act requires to be delivered and chusing rather to forfeit all benefit of it, and trust one another, by never entering their Books in the Register of the Stationers' Hall; or when this method is not safe enough, entering only one Volume of each sett; that being deemed effectual to prevent any other of the trade from printing such sett upon them. And thus, when complete setts of works have been claimed for any of the aforesaid Libraries, or even offers made to purchase the remaining Volumes not entered as the Acts direct, the Bookseller has not only refused to part with them gratis, but even to sell the remaining Volumes to such claimants, unless those other Volumes, that had been delivered, were likewise paid for at the same time.

Should a Prosecution be undertaken for the small Penalties appointed by these Acts, since the Clerk of the Stationers' Com-

<sup>1</sup> For a more elaborate discussion of matters summarized in this paragraph, see A. Birrell, *Copyright in Books*, London, 1899, 45-96. The actual workings of the Queen Anne Act seem to be rather inadequately treated by Birrell and by Aldis (*Camb. Hist. of Eng. Lit.*, xi, 311 ff.). Both take for granted that the law worked in practice as it seems to read. More satisfactory is *Copyright* by R. R. Bowker, Boston, 1912, 24 *et seq.*; but it merely summarizes the legal aspects of the case.

<sup>2</sup> *Observations occasioned by the Contest about Literary Property*, Cambridge, 1770. There is a copy in the Treasure Room of Harvard Library, bound up in Tr. 35. The ascription to Law is penciled on the title-page.

<sup>3</sup> The nine copies were supposed to come from the first, therefore the best, edition, often a folio with spacious margins; and this was a particular grievance; for the tax on paper was one of the chief items of expense in the book-trade.

pany, to whom application is made, only gives in his Accounts quarterly at the soonest, the Time fixed for commencing such Prosecutions must elapse before the University &c. can regularly make their demand, and receive notice whether it will be complied with or not; by which means the several Societies entitled to such a number of Books, are in a great measure deprived of the benefit intended for them by these Acts.

The Stationers Company in short, continued to go on in their old ways, to recognize no rights of the author, to give nothing to the Universities, and to maintain their monopoly by a boycott on independent concerns. Still, however, they needed some color of legal support. Parliament had failed them; and now they appealed to the courts to uphold their "ancient" and "traditional" rights. Chancery was favorable, and granted injunctions without time-limit against the impressions of country booksellers.<sup>4</sup> The Stationers even tried to bring a dummy case before Lord Mansfield in order to obtain a decision, once and for all, in their favor; but, after three hearings, the hoax was discovered.<sup>5</sup> The Queen Anne Act, however, fell into almost complete desuetude.

This economic situation gave the profits of literary work almost entirely to the bookseller. Jacob Tonson, "the gentleman usher to the Muses," could retire into Herefordshire at sixty, and leave his bookshop to descend in succession to his nephew and grand-nephew. Lintot died rich in 1736; and his grand-daughter made a fortune of £45,000 in partnership with Richardson. In 1759, Robert Dodlsey could turn over to his brother James the thriving business "At Tully's head." Authors, meanwhile—even some of those whose works sold the best—were often in distress.<sup>6</sup> Thomson

<sup>4</sup>London booksellers, moreover, did not deliver in the country: even as late as 1781, Cowper notes the great difficulty of getting books at Olney, *Letters*, ed. Wright, London, 1904, I, 246-7, 396. This helps to explain the illiteracy of rural England in the Eighteenth Century. Country booksellers could not print the classics, and the London trade did not supply the country.

<sup>5</sup> Birrell, *op. cit.*, 99-138.

<sup>6</sup>This fact has often been noted. In his *Life of Johnson*, Macaulay remarks that literature had never been "a less gainful calling." He attributes this condition to the decline of patronage and to the comparative paucity of the reading public at large. But, however large the public, the copyright situation gave the profits to the bookseller, not to the author. Stephen blames the authors' poverty on their shiftlessness (*Literature*

got virtually nothing from *The Seasons*, in spite of its popularity; and Fielding's plays and novels, although both were ubiquitously read, hardly alleviated his difficulties. Gray, later in the century, made a scant forty guineas from his *Elegy* and *Odes*,<sup>7</sup> although they are said to have brought Dodsley almost £1,000<sup>8</sup>; the opulent Walpole found literature an expensive amusement; and Johnson, the most celebrated writer of the age, was never affluent.<sup>9</sup> Various reasons operated in individual cases to cause this situation: Smart was improvident, and Johnson lacked business ability. The fact remains, however, that booksellers managed to pay low prices and gain large profits.<sup>10</sup> Only too common was the case of Dr. Whitby, who trudged all about London with his manuscript under his arm, only to discover that every firm made him exactly the same offer: they had all agreed on the matter *in camera*.<sup>11</sup> No wonder that the *Monthly* refers to the "rapaciousness" of booksellers and the "knavery of literary pirates";<sup>12</sup> that the writer of *The Case of Authors* (1758) found the literary trade a hopeless struggle of

and *Society in the Eighteenth Century*, London, 1907, 94 *et seq.*). This was true in certain individual cases, but surely no more so in the Eighteenth Century than in the Seventeenth or the Nineteenth. Some authors, moreover, like Congreve and Gray, had a supercilious attitude toward the career of letters, and they would naturally be an easy prey to booksellers; but the fact remains that, whatever an author might do, the law, as it actually worked, gave him no protection.

<sup>7</sup> Gray is generally believed, on Mason's authority, to have given his poems *gratis* to the booksellers. Mason probably received this impression from Gray's disapproval of writing for money. As the MS. letters of Mitford *et al.* in Harvard Treasure Room show, however, Gray sold Dodsley for £42, the rights to all his poems except one final printing, the posthumous edition edited by Mason. What arrangement was made for the Foulis edition of Glasgow, I do not know; but, in any case, that was, at the time of printing, beyond the pale of English copyright law.

<sup>8</sup> Straus, R., *Robert Dodsley, Poet, Publisher and Playwright*, London, 1910, 159. Naturally, not all publishers were so successful. See Plomer, H. R., *A Short History of English Printing*, London, 1900, 22 *et seq.*

<sup>9</sup> Very unusual is the case of Sterne who is said to have received £700 from Dodsley for two new volumes and a second edition of *Tristram Shandy* (*Letters of Gray*, London, 1913, II, 137-8); but there was a great demand for the book.

<sup>10</sup> See the list of publishers' prices, Aldis, *op. cit.*, XI, 321 *et seq.*, and D. N. B. *sub* Lintot.

<sup>11</sup> *Observations*, etc., *op. cit.* 8.

<sup>12</sup> *Mon. Rev. L.*, 82.

"wit" versus "money";<sup>13</sup> and that Foote's ridicule of "a Catch-penny Bookseller" gave "pleasure"<sup>14</sup> to the *Monthly* reviewer.

The objections of authors were numerous.<sup>15</sup> In 1747, Warburton wrote a plea for the rightful enforcement of Queen Anne's Act,<sup>16</sup> Johnson, in 1759, complained in a letter to the *Universal Chronicle*, against the plagiarizing of his papers from the *Idler*; and, in 1764, Mason quarreled over copyright with James Dodsley.<sup>17</sup> *A Vindication of the Exclusive Rights of Authors* urged the *litterati* to action;<sup>18</sup> and various schemes resulted. William Stevenson in black letters informed the public that his *Poems* were entered as the Act directed.<sup>19</sup> Lloyd, following Churchill's example, inscribed every copy of his *Methodist* with his initials,<sup>20</sup> and so also did the anonymous author of *The Frequented Village*.<sup>21</sup> *The Case of Authors* in 1758 had urged the men of letters to "out-combine the very booksellers themselves"; and the Literary Society was instituted. A few books were actually printed; but there was no means of publication, except by the Company's booksellers, who charged at least 28% on "pamphlets" from 6d to 2s, and 15% on books of 5s and over.<sup>22</sup> Some authors tried to publish by subscription;

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, XVIII, 348; *Crit. Rev.*, v, 175. The prints of the day reflect this. See Rowlandson's water-color and Wigstead's cartoon the *Bookseller and the Author* in *Paston's Caricature in the Eighteenth Century*, London, 1905, plate civ and p. 71.

<sup>14</sup> See review of Foote's *Author*, *Mon. Rev.*, xvi, 361.

<sup>15</sup> Up to the mid-century, the artist was no more protected than the man of letters. Finally, Hogarth forced through an act (5 Geo. II) to protect his satirical drawings. Unfortunately, it gave no protection to written compositions; nor did it apparently keep others from using Hogarth's name to advertise their own work (*Crit. Rev.*, vii, 274).

<sup>16</sup> *A Letter from an Author to a Member of Parliament concerning Literary Property*, London, 1747. It appeared anonymously, and the *Brit. Mus. Cat.* questions Warburton's authorship; but Hurd included it in his edition of Warburton's *Works*.

<sup>17</sup> Straus *op. cit.*, 115.

<sup>18</sup> *Crit. Rev.*, xiv, 86. The difficulty, not to say impossibility, of access to some of these pamphlets, has obliged the writer to rely considerably on contemporary reviews.

<sup>19</sup> See *Crit. Rev.*, xx, 124.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, xxii, 75. This was not a new device; Mrs. T. C. Phillips in her *Apology* for her conduct, London, c. 1742, had used it when the booksellers refused to bring out her book, and she was obliged to issue it herself.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, xxxii, 391.

<sup>22</sup> *Observations, etc.*, *op. cit.*, 7.

Pope's *Homer* had had its list of stars and garters; and Robert Hill published his *Poems* by the subscription of "mechanics and shop-keepers of various denominations";<sup>23</sup> but such enterprises, the Stationers often "stifled at birth"; or at all events, they could delay the imprint.<sup>24</sup> Thomas Malton, in his *Essay Concerning the Publication of Works on Science and Literature by Subscription*, declared that the method was "usually found by authors to be a very troublesome business,"<sup>25</sup> and, in 1790, Cowper thought himself lucky to get enough subscriptions for his *Homer* merely to pay the cost of printing.<sup>26</sup> The process was long and cumbersome; and most authors "obliged by hunger and request of friends," had to sell their wares at once and outright—even for a "mere trifle."<sup>27</sup> In short, combination did not overthrow the bookseller, nor did subscription circumvent his economic control: Walpole might print Gray's *Elegy* at his private press; but Dodsley was necessary to publish it.

Meanwhile, the book trade thrived with the increase of the reading public. Booksellers in Scotland looked with increasing envy at their fortunate brethren of London; and finally Alexander Donaldson, "the Caledonian Dodsley," opened a shop in the metropolis for the sale of cheap Scotch editions.<sup>28</sup> His coming was heralded by *Some Thoughts on the State of Literary Property*, a tract which was aimed at the London monopoly.<sup>29</sup> In 1767, another pamphlet, attributed to Lord Dreghorn,<sup>30</sup> came out, this time from Donaldson's own press at Edinburgh: *Consideration on the Nature and Origin of Literary Property*. He established his shop and the battle was on. Suit for damages was soon brought against him for selling pirated copies; and the first trial went badly;<sup>31</sup> but, on appeal to the Lords, the case was finally decided

<sup>23</sup> *Crit. Rev.*, XXXIX, 340. According to the *Monthly* only the greatest poet dared to publish "without the kindly shelter . . . of a good subscription." III, 334.

<sup>24</sup> *Observations*, etc., 10.

<sup>25</sup> *Mon. Rev.*, LVII, 322.

<sup>26</sup> Cowper, *Letters*, op. cit., III, 487. <sup>27</sup> *Observations*, etc., 7-8.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Aldis, in *Camb. Hist.*, XI, 315.

<sup>29</sup> London, 1764; it was published anonymously; but the imprint "for Alexander Donaldson" shows its inspiration.

<sup>30</sup> So ascribed in TR 32, Harvard Library.

<sup>31</sup> See *A Letter from a Gentleman in Edinburgh to his Friend in London*, concerning Literary Property. 1769 [?London] ascribed in Harvard Library, TR 32, to Edmund Law, Bishop of Carlisle, to whom was also ascribed the *Observations* of 1770.

in his favor in the spring of 1774.<sup>32</sup> The question apparently involved was that of the duration of copyright; whether the Queen Anne Act superseded the Stationers' ancient claims of perpetual property, or whether it was merely supplementary to them. At the same time, charges for printing pirated editions were brought against him before the Court of Session in Scotland<sup>33</sup>; and the decision was against the upholders of perpetual copyright.<sup>34</sup> The monopoly was broken; the publishing business was thrown open to competition; and this, in due course, gave authors an opportunity to bring their works into a free market, operating on a fair basis of supply and demand.

At the time, many authors did not realize this advantage: they saw only that perpetual copyright was no longer within their grasp, and that legal chaos prevailed. The literary were in a ferment.<sup>35</sup> Half a dozen tracts *pro* and *con* appeared at once.<sup>36</sup> Walpole felt himself in an anomalous position: "It does not appear to me," he wrote Mason, "that the case of authors *i. e.* of those few<sup>37</sup> writers who like me have published by means of a bookseller and have not reserved the right of copy in themselves, has ever yet been considered in either of the debates. At present, I have lost all right and title in all my own things, merely because my bookseller neglected to enter them in Stationers' Hall."<sup>38</sup> Mrs. Macaulay's *Modest Plea for the Property of Copyright*<sup>39</sup> declared: "If literary property becomes common, we can have but two kinds of authors, men in opulence and men in dependence." Beattie was indignant, and wrote Mrs. Montagu that Mason "is tempted to throw his *Life of Gray* (which is now finished or nearly so) into the fire, so much is he dissatisfied with the late decision on property."<sup>40</sup>

<sup>32</sup> On this second trial, Birrell gives considerable detail. See 124 *et seq.* Lord Mansfield did not attend.

<sup>33</sup> See James Boswell, *The Decision of the Court of Session upon the Question of Literary Property*, Edinburgh, 1774.

<sup>34</sup> Lord Monboddo dissented.

<sup>35</sup> Walpole *Letters*, ed. Toynbee, Oxford, 1904, VIII, 423, 433-4.

<sup>36</sup> See *Mon. Rev.*, I, 81 *et seq.*, 202 *et seq.*, and 273 *et seq.*

<sup>37</sup> Probably not as "few" as Walpole supposed.

<sup>38</sup> Walpole *Letters*, ed. Cunn., VI, 432.

<sup>39</sup> Reviewed in *Gent's Mag.*, XLIV, 124 *et seq.*

<sup>40</sup> Forbes, *Life of Beattie*, N. Y. and Boston, 1807, 240.

What most alarmed the literary—and with some reason—was the possibility of Scotch infringement of even the twenty-eight years copyright which the Queen Anne Act allowed.<sup>41</sup> Mason's edition of Gray came out in 1775; and Murray, a Scotch bookseller, quoted from it some fifty lines in his *Poetical Miscellany*. Mason, chiefly from principle—for the penalties could not amount to more than a few pounds—commenced an action in Chancery to recover damages. Murray offered to settle out of court; but, as this would have evaded the legal question, Mason refused.<sup>42</sup> Murray then published a pamphlet, *A Letter to W. Mason, A. M. Precentor of York, concerning his edition of Mr. Gray's Poems, and the Practices of Booksellers*,<sup>43</sup> in which he denounced Mason as a "mercenary author."<sup>44</sup> The Rev. John Whitaker, a friend of Murray's embraced the occasion to call Mason a "weak divine"; and Johnson signified his displeasure, and damned him as a "Whig."<sup>45</sup> Mason's law-suit, however, gained its ends; in 1778, he received a judgment in his favor that established the validity of the Queen Anne Statute against violation from across the Tweed; and, although many legal details remained to be adjusted, the author was at last fairly safe from robbery either by a greedy monopoly or by a literary pirate.

The control which the Stationers had held down to the last quarter of the century affected writers and readers alike; the former were obliged to seek in the church or in the university the living which patronage had ceased to provide; the latter either gained little taste for books, or found it difficult and expensive to get them. The Stationers Company retreated slowly; it gave up the monopoly of presses, the monopoly of registry; it evaded the Queen Anne Act, and held its old position by a trade boycott and

<sup>41</sup> Enfringement of copyright under the guise of reviewing or summarizing was common even in England, *Crit. Rev.*, VI, 495; IX, 229; XIX, 233. Secret importations from Holland, moreover, such as robbed Lintot of his profits in Pope's *Homer*, were fairly common.

<sup>42</sup> Walpole *Letters*, Cunn. ed., VI, 437, 454n and 464; Vide also S. Smiles, *A Publisher and his Friends*, London, 1891, I, 15. It gives a rather one-sided view of the matter.

<sup>43</sup> Vide Nichols, *Lit. Anecd.*, III, 730; also *Gent's Mag.*, XLVII, 332.

<sup>44</sup> This charge was doubly unfair: not only did the suit cost Mason more than he could ever gain; but the income from the *Gray* was being devoted to charity, Walpole *Letters*, Cunn. ed., V, 336-8 n.

<sup>45</sup> Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, Hill ed., III, 294.

by court injunctions; but, as education progressed and as the public demand for books increased, the boycott grew less efficient; and finally the courts gave away. In 1747, Mason had offered to edit Milton's minor poems *gratis* for Dodsley; but Tonson controlled the copyright, and the scheme was dropped.<sup>46</sup> In 1762, Donaldson published an edition in Edinburgh, brought copies up to London, and sold them in spite of Tonson. In 1775, Blandon printed *Paradise Lost* in London itself; and the fiction of Tonson's "property" right was over. Cowper or Hayley might edit Milton, and anyone might print or publish the text. An author's royalties were safe, at least so far as Great Britain was concerned, for his twenty-eight years; then his book, if it had permanent value, became public property; and the bookseller could no longer dictate arbitrary terms to the reading public or to the man of letters.

JOHN W. DRAPER.

*University of Minnesota.*

---

#### NOTES ON BEN JONSON'S *CATILINE*

The following notes are offered as supplementary to a recent commentary on the *Catiline*, published by Dr. L. H. Harris, New Haven, 1916.

ii, 191. Fulvia's gibe at Sempronia and her lovers,

Yes, and they study your kitchen more than you,

is taken from Tiresias' comment on the wooers of Penelope, Horace, *Sat.* ii, 5, 79-80,

Venit enim magnum donandi parca iuventus,  
Nec tantum Veneris quantum studiosa culinae.

iii, 1-50. The Consul's speech is taken freely from the beginning of Cicero's Second Oration on the Agrarian Law. Compare lines 4-6,

where, if he erre,  
He findes no pardon; and for doing well,  
A most small praise, and that wrung out by force,

---

<sup>46</sup> Straus *op cit.*, 114-5.

with Cicero, 2, 5,

cuius errato nulla venia, recte facto exigua laus et ab invitis  
expressa proponitur;

19-25,

But a new man (as I am stil'd in Rome)  
Whom you have dignified; and, more, in whom  
Yo' have cut a way, and left it ope for vertue  
Hereafter, to that place which our great men  
Held shut up, with all ramparts, for themselves.  
Nor have but few of them in time been made  
Your Consuls so; new men, before me, none, etc.,

with 1, 3,

Me . . . hominem novum consulem fecistis, et eum locum  
quem nobilitas praesidiis firmatum atque omni ratione obvallatum  
tenebat me duce rescidistis, virtutique in posterum patere  
voluistis. Neque me tantum modo consulem . . . sed ita fecistis  
quo modo pauci nobiles in hac civitate consules facti sunt, novus  
ante me nemo, etc.;

32-39,

But my care,  
My industrie and vigilance now must worke,  
That still your counsellis of me be approv'd  
Both by yourselves and those to whom you have,  
With grudge, prefer'd me; two things I must labour,  
That neither they upbraid, nor you repent you.  
For every lapse of mine will now be call'd  
Your error, if I make such,

with 3, 6,

Quod si solus in discrimen aliquod adducerer, ferrem, Quirites,  
animo aequiore; sed mihi videntur certi homines, si qua in re  
me non modo consilio, verum etiam casu lapsum esse arbitra-  
buntur, vos universos, qui me antetuleritis nobilitati, vituperati.  
Mihi autem, Quirites, omnia potius perpetienda esse duco  
quam non ita gerendum consulatum, ut in omnibus meis factis  
atque consiliis vestrum de me factum consiliumque laudetur;

and 47-52,

I know well in what termes I doe receive  
The common wealth, how vexed, how perplex'd;  
In which there's not that mischiefe, or ill fate,  
That good men feare not, wicked men expect not.  
I know, beside, some turbulent practises  
Areadie on foot, and rumors of moe dangers,

with 3, 8,

Ego qualem Kalendis Ianuariis acceperim rem publicam, Quirites, intellego, plenam sollicitudinis, plenam timoris; in qua nihil erat mali, nihil adversi, quod non boni metuerent, improbi expectarent; omnia turbulenta consilia, etc.

The opening words of this speech, "Great honors are great burdens," represent a familiar Latin play on the words *honos*, *onus*. Cp. the proverb "Est onus omnis honor;" Ovid, *Her.* ix, 31, "non honor est sed onus."

iii, 85. "Most popular Consul." Cp. Cicero, *De Lege Agraria*, ii, 4, 9, "dixi . . . me popularem consulem futurum," etc.

iii, 108. "And watch the watcher." Cp. Juvenal, vi, 347, "sed quis custodiet ipsos Custodes?"

iii, 280. "The farre-triumphed world." Cp. Ovid, *Amores*, i, 15, 26, "Roma triumphati dum caput orbis erit."

iii, 753. "Emulous Carthage." Cp. Sallust, *Catiline*, x, 1, "Carthago aemula imperi Romani;" also, Horace, *Epod.* xvi, 5, "aemula nec virtus Capuae," etc.

iv, 64-65 (cp. v, 103-4).

What may be happy and auspicious still  
To Rome and hers.

Cp. the frequent formulae of the sort in Livy; e. g., i, 28, 7, "quod bonum faustum felixque sit populo Romano," etc.; also Cicero, *Div.* i, 102, "maiores nostri . . . omnibus rebus gerendis 'quod bonum faustum felix fortunatumque esset' praefabantur."

iv, 755-757,

like Capaneus at Thebes,  
They should hang dead upon the highest spires,  
And aske the second bolt, to be throwne downe.

Cp. Statius, *Thebais*, x, 936-939 (of Capaneus),

Pectoraque invisibilibus obicit flammantia muris,  
Ne caderet; . . . . .  
. . . . . paulum si tardius artus  
Cessissent, potuit fulmen sperare secundum.

v, 56-63. The speech of Petreius to his soldiers,

Chiefly, when this sure joy shall crowne our side,  
That the least man who falls upon our partie  
This day (as some must give their happy names

To fate, and that eternall memorie  
 Of the best death, writ with it, for their countrey)  
 Shall walke at pleasure in the tents of rest,  
 And see farre off, beneath him, all their host  
 Tormented after life, etc.,

should perhaps be compared with Cicero's Fourteenth Philippic, xii, 31,

O fortunata mors, quae naturae debita pro patria est potissimum reddita! . . . Etenim Mars ipse ex acie fortissimum quemque pignerari solet. Illi igitur impii, quos cecidistis, etiam ad inferos poenas parricidii luent; vos vero, qui extremum spiritum in victoria effudistis, piorum estis sedem et locum consecuti. Brevis a natura vita vobis data est, at memoria bene redditae vitae sempiterna.

W. P. MUSTARD.

*The Johns Hopkins University.*

#### CHAUCER AND THE "FOWLE OK"

A robbery *per se* committed five centuries and more ago may not be of much importance; when, however, it concerns the poet Chaucer the matter assumes proportions of interest. The poet, according to the records, was robbed near the "fowle ok" September 3, 1390; and exactly three days later he was robbed twice,—at Westminster, and at Hatcham, Surrey.<sup>1</sup> Whether there were three robberies inside of four days, or whether through blunders in the documents there were but two has never been definitely decided. Mr. Selby<sup>2</sup> did not attempt, in his exhaustive investigation of the robberies, to identify the Foul Oak incident with either of the other two. Mr. Kirk<sup>3</sup> thought that if the accounts are to be taken literally there were three holdups, though elsewhere<sup>4</sup> he considered Skeat's identification as "probable." Skeat<sup>5</sup> had remarked that the robbery at "Hatcham, Surrey (now a part of London, approached by the Old Kent Road and not far from Deptford and Greenwich;" was identical with the one near the Foul Oak. Thus,

<sup>1</sup> *Life-Records*, 2nd series (1875), Part I.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 5 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* (1900), p. xl; cf. *ibid.*, Part IV, p. 292 note.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. xli note.

<sup>5</sup> *Works*, I, p. xli.

according to Skeat, there were but two robberies—at Westminster and at Hatcham, a view that several writers have held by implication or in express terms: for example, Lounsbury,<sup>6</sup> Wyatt,<sup>7</sup> Emerson,<sup>8</sup> Pollard,<sup>9</sup> J. W. H[ales],<sup>10</sup> Wells.<sup>11</sup> Liddell,<sup>12</sup> on the other hand, assumes but one robbery; MacCracken<sup>13</sup> says there were two—but both committed “near the Foul Oak in Kent.” Coulton<sup>14</sup> darkens counsel when he writes: the poet “was the victim of at least two, and just possibly three, highway robberies (of which two were on one day) at Westminster, and near ‘The Foul Oak’ at Hatcham.” When to these conflicting accounts are added other contradictory statements—for example the amount of money lost at Hatcham, £9 44d.,<sup>15</sup> is said by Skeat to have been £9 3s. 2d.; by Hales £9 3s. 6d.; and by Pollard £9 3s. 8d.—no apology it is hoped should be necessary for attempting to settle a small point in the life of Chaucer.

In view of the fact that the poet's unfortunate experiences during this first week of September have interested Chaucer scholars for half a century, it seems surprising that an entry in the *Rolls of Parliament*,<sup>16</sup> which seems to clear up the matter, should have been overlooked. Additional interest attaches itself to the story in the *Rolls* in that a business associate of Chaucer—Nicholas Brembre, a prominent Londoner—is concerned.

In 1387 the fatal Parliament charged Brembre with having taken twenty-two prisoners from Newgate, and “les amesnoit hors de Loundr' en le Counte de Kent a une lieu q est appelle le Foul Oke,” where they were beheaded.

This reference, then, definitely identifies Foul Oak with Kent; moreover it was a place, and not a patriarch of the forest; and obviously it was an isolated community, though apparently not far

<sup>6</sup> *Life*, I, pp. 84 f.

<sup>7</sup> *Chaucer* (selections), no date, p. 6.

<sup>8</sup> *Chaucer: Selected Poems* (1911), p. xvii.

<sup>9</sup> *Chaucer* (Globe edition), p. xix; *Ency. Brit.*, 11th ed., VI, p. 14.

<sup>10</sup> *Dict. Natl. Biog.*, X, p. 165. He incorrectly gives the 9th of Sept.

<sup>11</sup> *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English*, 1916, p. 615.

<sup>12</sup> *Chaucer* (selections), 1902, p. cxvi.

<sup>13</sup> *A College Chaucer*, 1913, p. 595.

<sup>14</sup> *Chaucer and his England*, 1908, p. 63.

<sup>15</sup> *Life-Records*, Part I, pp. 19, 30. One entry (p. 19) indeed gives 43d.

<sup>16</sup> III, p. 231.

from London. It would seem therefore that the records may be trusted<sup>17</sup>: the poet was held up thrice inside of four days. Judging from the amount of travelling about he did during these first days of September, one concludes that Chaucer's duties as Clerk of the Works were somewhat arduous; at any rate the tasks must have been time—and energy—consumers. The poet's life at this particular period could not have been one of such leisure as is supposed to accompany the poetic muse.<sup>18</sup> Nor is it at all likely that his entire two years (1389-1391) as royal clerk were much less strenuous. All this of course has a bearing on the composition of the *Canterbury Tales*, which were then under way.

Goucher College.

E. P. KUHLE.

---

<sup>17</sup> Of course the record explicitly states that the holdup was *near* the Foul Oak. Even then, however, it seems impossible to accept the conclusions of Skeat and others,—that the robbery referred to is the one in Surrey (Hatcham). In the first place we must assume the date (September 3) to be incorrect; again, the Foul Oak and Hatcham entries do not agree in the amount of money lost by the poet. Though, to be sure, the Hatcham records vary as to the amount, yet of the three accounts two give £9 44d. (and 43d.) (Part I, pp. 19, 30), and the third £20 6s. 8d. (Part IV, p. 339). Again, it is not certain that the culprits (whether one or two gangs) responsible for the holdups on the 6th, namely at Westminster and Hatcham, were the same persons who held up the poet on the 3rd (cf. Kirk, "Forewords," *Life-Records*, p. xli). Though it may be urged that both at Hatcham and near the Foul Oak the poet lost goods (*moebles*), a horse, and (according to one entry) *nearly* the same amount of money—£20, 6s. 8d. and £20 respectively, which thus suggests but a single holdup, yet a glance at the records of other robberies by the various highwaymen shows that goods and horses were not uncommon booty (cf. Part I, pp. 8, 12 ff.). It should be emphasized that there is no greater difficulty in accepting three than two mishaps, for the highwaymen were particularly active at this time (cf. Part I). Is it significant, finally, that the King was in Kent (at his manor of Eltham) when he pardoned Chaucer of the loss near the Foul Oak (cf. Part IV, p. 292)?

<sup>18</sup> The legal matters pertaining to the robberies occupied the poet's attention off and on for months (cf. Kirk, "Forewords," p. xlii, Part I, pp. 12 ff.).

## THE EARLY SENTIMENTAL DRAMAS OF RICHARD CUMBERLAND

1761-1778: *The Banishment of Cicero*; *The Summer's Tale*; *Amelia*; *The Brothers*; *Timon of Athens*; *The Fashionable Lover*; *The Note of Hand*; *The Cholerick Man*; *The Battle of Hastings*; *The Princess of Parma*.

Richard Cumberland, the dramatist, speaks in his *Memoirs* of his plays as "a long list of dramas, such as I presume no English author has yet equalled *in point of number*." This is a statement disingenuous enough, unless we suppose Cumberland ignorant of the prolific Elizabethans, Marston, Decker, and Heywood. The dramatist is equally pompous, but more truthful when he says, later: "When I attempt to look into the mass of my productions, I can keep no order in the enumeration of them; I have not patience to arrange them according to their dates: I believe I have written at least fifty dramas published and unpublished."

Cumberland's carelessness in losing sight of his dramas has rendered a complete collection of them difficult. He himself in the *Memoirs* indexes thirty-eight dramatic pieces; Genest assigns him forty-three; *Biographia Dramatica* credits him with fifty-four; and a student more patient than the author himself may record others. Neither of the two dramatic dictionaries makes mention of a play called *The Confession*, printed in a collection of plays called *The Posthumous Dramatic Works of Richard Cumberland*. Three other plays may be attributed to Cumberland upon more or less reputable authority.<sup>1</sup>

*The Banishment of Cicero*, written about 1761, and concerned with the conspiracy of Clodius, Piso, and Gabinius against Tully, never found an audience, save David Garrick, whose friendship for Cumberland began at this time. *Biographia Dramatica* finds the unpleasant scenes "too vicious and shocking to come within the decent clothing of tragic muse."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *The Elders*, a farce acted at Kelmarsh, Northamptonshire; *The Days of Geri*, in a list compiled by Sir Walter Scott; *Palamon and Arcite*, in manuscript form in the British Museum.

<sup>2</sup> *Biographia Dramatica*, III, 47.

In 1765 Cumberland ventured into a dramatic field for which he was totally unfitted. On December 6, an operetta, *The Summer's Tale*, with music by Abel, Bach, and Arne was produced at Covent Garden Theatre. The piece had a run of nine nights.<sup>3</sup> The play was judged a failure by the critics, but Cumberland brought it forward three years later under another name; it was altered, and acted as *Amelia* at Covent Garden on April 12, 1768. The piece was again acted, with alterations, on December 14, 1771, at Drury Lane Theatre. Mudford, in his *Life of Cumberland*, asserts that *Amelia* is a convincing proof of the dramatist's unwillingness to admit any play of his to be a failure.

On December 2, 1769, at Covent Garden Theatre, was acted *The Brothers*. "It was written," Cumberland affirms, "after my desultory manner, at such short periods of time and leisure as I could snatch from business or the society of my family. . . Neither was it any interruption, if my children were playing about me in the room."<sup>4</sup> The comedy was probably finished early in 1768, for a letter of March 21 of this year to Garrick can hardly refer to another play: "I have," says Cumberland, "a comedy in my possession which has never been in any hands but my own, and is, both in plot and execution, entirely new and original."<sup>5</sup> The offer was apparently refused, but the comedy was subsequently accepted by Covent Garden Theatre. Cumberland's happiest inspiration in the writing of *The Brothers* was a passage in the epilogue which won for him the friendship of Garrick. The play was acted about twenty-two times, and enjoyed many revivals. The popularity of *The Brothers*<sup>6</sup> secured for Cumberland the patronage

<sup>3</sup> Further comment upon *The Summer's Tale* may be found in *The Gentleman's Magazine* for December, 1765, *The Universal Magazine* for December, 1765, *The Universal Museum* for December, 1765, *The London Magazine* for December, 1765, and *The Royal Magazine* for December, 1765. All these periodicals contain specimens of the lyrics of the musical comedy.

<sup>4</sup> *Memoirs*, I, 264. Cumberland has a tendency to emphasize his casual method of composition. See Mudford, *Life of Cumberland*, p. 188.

<sup>5</sup> *Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, I, 293. Cumberland to Garrick, March 21, 1768.

<sup>6</sup> A version of *The Brothers* in prose may be found in Miss Macauley's *Tales of the Drama*, p. 239. *The Brothers* was not at first definitely known to be Cumberland's.

*The Whitehall Evening Post* of December 4, 1769, says: "Notwithstanding some reports to the contrary, we can assure our readers that the new

and protection of Garrick, and definitely established him as a writer of "legitimate comedy." Its success gave ihm courage to begin *The West Indian*. *The West Indian*, acted on January 19, 1771, has been discussed in an earlier issue of this periodical.

The same year which brought forth *The West Indian* offered the first of Cumberland's adaptations of Shakespeare. *Timon of Athens* was acted at Drury Lane on December 4, 1771. This play was followed on January 20, 1772, at the same playhouse, by *The Fashionable Lover*. This production, a comedy of manners with a Scotch hero, found favor second only to that of *The West Indian*. *The Fashionable Lover* was acted, at its first appearance, about fifteen times. There were two revivals of the play at Covent Garden, on May 9, 1786, and April 9, 1808. A performance followed on December 8, 1808, at Bath, and a revival occurred at Drury Lane in 1818, seven years after the author's death. Cumberland was partial to *The Fashionable Lover*, and openly prefers it in the Prologue to either *The Brothers* or *The West Indian*, saying to the audience:

Two you have reared; but between you and me,  
This youngest is the fav'rite of the three.

"I confess," Cumberland says in the *Memoirs*, "I flattered myself that I had outgone *The West Indian* in point of composition."

*The Note of Hand*,<sup>1</sup> a farce, was acted at Drury Lane on February 9, 1774, and later on October 19, at the same theatre,

Comedy called *The Brothers*, is written by — Cumberland; who possesses a considerable post in the Treasury, and is the author of a tragedy called, *The Banishment of Cicero*, and a musical Comedy, entitled *The Summer's Tale*."

Further comment upon *The Brothers* may be found in *The Weekly Magazine* of December 14, and December 21, 1769, *Scot's Magazine* for December, 1769, Boaden, *Life of Mrs. Jordan*, II, 106, Mrs. Inchbald, *The British Theatre*, p. 18.

For American productions of *The Brothers*, see Seilhamer, *History of the American Theatre, 1749-1774*, I, 330 (sometimes named *The Shipwreck*).

<sup>1</sup> *The London Magazine*, February, 1774. See also *The Oxford Magazine*, February, 1774. Further comment upon *The Note of Hand* may be found in *The Sentimental Magazine* for February, 1774, *The Westminster Magazine* for February, 1774, *The London Chronicle* of February 10, 1774, *Memoirs*, I, 388, Mudford, *Life of Cumberland*, p. 318, and *Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, I, 621, Doctor Hoadly to Garrick, April 10, 1774.

*The Election*, "the production of a hasty hour."<sup>8</sup> "Considered as a literary composition," says *Lloyd's Evening Post* of October 21, "this interlude is the most execrable we ever met with," but declares that it is timely: "As all Election matter depends upon being well timed than well written, we doubt not it will be a favorite with the audience when it is more perfect in the Performance, as it really has a very good stage effect." *The Election* manifests Cumberland's usual idealistic tendency: "The author flatters himself it breathes throughout that freedom and independency which is ever so grateful to us all tempered with that loyalty and harmony which is so necessary to promote the general happiness."<sup>9</sup>

*The Cholerick Man*, produced at Drury Lane on December 19, 1774, was another venture of the same year. A character named Old Nightshade bore the brunt of the critics' assaults, and seemed to violate all the decorum of sentimental comedy. Davies denounced him as "a wretch without the least tincture of humanity," and one who was "fit for no place but Bedlam,"<sup>10</sup> and *The St. James Chronicle*, after praising his analogues in the *Adelphi*, *L'École des Maris*, and *The Squire of Alsatia*, almost shouts that he is "a despicable Character, made up of Noise, Nonsense, Outrage, and Madness."<sup>11</sup> "We can scarcely recognize," says the dramatic critic of *Lloyd's Evening Post* of December 19, "the nature and humour exhibited in the paternal severity of Terence's Demea in the grim distortions and wild ravings of Old Nightshade." "Nightshade," says Arthur Murphy, ". . . is in one continued rage from beginning to end. The author should have considered that no man lives in a perpetual whirlwind of passion. . . . If Mr. Cumberland," concludes Murphy, "had copied nature, the audience would have had the pleasure resulting from variety; and the fits

<sup>8</sup> *The Town and Country Magazine*, October, 1774.

<sup>9</sup> *The Town and Country Magazine*, October, 1774.

*Biographia Dramatica* says that *The Election* was never printed, but *The Gentleman's Magazine* for January, 1775, contains the following item: "A new musical interlude, called the election, as it is performed at the theatre royal in Drury Lane, 8vo. 6d. Griffin."

Further comment upon *The Election* may be found in *The Universal Magazine* for October, 1774, and *The London Magazine* for October, 1774.

<sup>10</sup> *Memoirs of the Life of David Garrick*, II, 273-4.

<sup>11</sup> *The St. James Chronicle*, December 22, 1774.

and starts of his angry boy might have helped to retard, and, at times, to forward the main business of the plot."<sup>12</sup>

Young Nightshade, who reminds the reader of Tony Lumpkin, was thought "too knowing and too shrewd,"<sup>13</sup> at least for a "Country Put;"<sup>13</sup> Gregory fell below the standard set in *The Squire of Alsatia*; and—alas! for Cumberland's learning!—Young Manlove was reckoned "but a faint copy of the ingenious Æschines."<sup>13</sup>

*The Battle of Hastings* was finally accepted by Sheridan, it is supposed, only by the grace of Garrick's influence. The hand of the universal mender of plays is apparent upon every page of the tragedy, and, as usual, Cumberland is amusingly busy, revising, and rewriting. We have, at first, Cumberland's sour thanks for Garrick's candid opinion of an epilogue, with the enclosure of another, fortified by a host of apologies, and a conclusion saying that he "wrote it post-haste directly upon reading Garrick's letter." Of the amendments Cumberland writes: "The whole which you recommend is done: Edwina's simile of the Tower (act the first) is made very impassioned; the conclusion of the fourth act was before your criticism came to hand entirely reformed, and I owed the correction to Miss Young's protest against the simile of the lightning;<sup>14</sup> your observation tallying with what I had done was particularly pleasing."<sup>15</sup> The anticipated criticism is characteristic. The letters reflect Sheridan's and Cumberland's uneasiness. "We have as yet had no rehearsal," he writes Garrick, "nor can I tell when we shall. . . . Without some prudence and patience I should never have got the ladies cordially into their business, nor should I not only have avoided a jar with Mr. Smith,<sup>16</sup> but so far have impressed him in my favor as to draw an offer from him (though too late) of taking the part of Edwin."<sup>17</sup> Cumberland

<sup>12</sup> *Life of David Garrick*, II, 108.

<sup>13</sup> *The St. James Evening Chronicle*, December 22, 1774.

<sup>14</sup> *The Town and Country Magazine* for January, 1778, complains that Cumberland, "a volunteer in the service of his favourite muse Thalia," "aims too much at the sublime, and the gods themselves often were incapable of understanding him."

<sup>15</sup> *Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, II, 283, Cumberland to Garrick, January 4, 1778.

<sup>16</sup> Cumberland writes Garrick: "Mr. Smith has made good my apprehensions, and refused taking any part in my tragedy but that of Edgar."

<sup>17</sup> *Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, II, 283.

wrote Henderson, the actor, concerning the role. On October 25, 1777, Henderson replies to Cumberland: "I am much obliged and honoured by your intelligence respect the Battle of Hastings. . . . As soon as I have gone through the Roman Father, which I now have in rehearsals, I shall dedicate my studies to the Battle."<sup>18</sup> Early in January Henderson is well established as Edgar, for Cumberland tells Garrick that "Henderson returns Saturday next, and we shall have three practices this week."<sup>19</sup> The success of Henderson in Edgar was dubious, and Cumberland chose to blame his friend rather than the heavy and unnatural character he himself had created. "He did not possess," says the dramatist, "the graces of person or deportment, and that character demanded both; an actor might have been found who with inferior abilities would have been a fitter representative for it."<sup>20</sup> "I am not surprised," writes J. H. Pye, in regard to the failure of this actor in *The Battle of Hastings*, "at the fate of Henderson."<sup>21</sup> The first performance of *The Battle of Hastings* was on January 24, 1778. It was acted twelve times.<sup>22</sup>

During the same year in which *The Battle of Hastings* was acted, Cumberland produced *The Princess of Parma*, a tragedy. This play was acted privately, on October 20 and October 21, 1778, in Mr. Hanbury's theatre at Kelmarsh, Northamptonshire. Cumberland himself was one of the *dramatis personæ*.

STANLEY T. WILLIAMS.

Yale University.

---

<sup>18</sup> *Letters and Poems by the late Mr. John Henderson*, p. 293, Henderson to Cumberland, October 25, 1777.

<sup>19</sup> *Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, II, 285, Cumberland to Garrick, Monday evening (probably February 5, 1778).

<sup>20</sup> *Memoirs*, I, 391.

<sup>21</sup> *Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, II, 291, J. H. Pye to Garrick, February 21, 1778.

<sup>22</sup> Genest, VI, 6-8. See *Ibid.*, VI, 6, for a comparison of *The Battle of Hastings* with Boyce's *Harold*. Further comment upon this play may be found in *Lloyd's Evening Post* of January 26, 1778, *The London Chronicle* of January 25, 1778, *Biographia Dramatica*, III, 51, and Mudford, *Life of Cumberland*, p. 320.

## REVIEWS

*La Pensée italienne au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle et le courant libertin*, par J.-ROGER CHARBONNEL, Paris, Champion, 1919. ix + A-UU + 720 + lxxxiv pp.

During the past quarter-century there has been a marked renaissance of interest in the literature of the French Renaissance as well as in that of the fifteenth century—two important periods of transition in French thought that had been largely neglected by students of both ancient and modern literature. Now that our knowledge of these epochs has been greatly augmented by monographs and other studies of a specialized nature, we are in a better position to understand their cultural background. And for a broad appreciation of the various literary movements, nothing is of greater importance than thorough investigations into the introduction or penetration of ideas from foreign countries. For example, Miss Le Duc, in her interesting dissertation on *Gontier Col and the French Pre-Renaissance*,<sup>1</sup> emphasized the role of diplomats and ambassadors in the dissemination of culture at the close of the fourteenth century and the beginning of the fifteenth. Again, M. Renaudet traced back to their sources the currents of thought that flowed mainly from the north. And now the present work approaches the subject from a somewhat similar point of vantage. In fact, this study, as its title indicates, is a history of ideas, especially in Italy, and their introduction into France. Its value is such that one can only wish that something similar may be done for other fields, such for instance as the history of the influence of the Church on French thought—a research that can be undertaken only by a scholar thoroughly familiar with medieval theology. It should consist of careful investigations of texts and documents of a widely varying nature, and not of the cursory and incomplete sketch so characteristic of contributions of this kind, some of which unfortunately only serve to give us false impressions. And just as the splendid study of M. Charbonnel will, if not revolutionize, at least help us to revise our conception of the trend of thought in the

<sup>1</sup> Lancaster, Pa., 1918.

seventeenth century, so a work of the type mentioned above will enable us to acquire a far more accurate understanding than we perhaps possess at present of the great epoch which we imperfectly designate as the Dark Ages.

One of the outstanding facts that impress us on approaching the study of the Renaissance in France is the remarkable open mindedness and desire for knowledge manifested by the leading thinkers of that important period. How eagerly they welcomed new ideas! Du Bellay and Peletier were seeking out new paths in poetry and prosody; Meigret, Peletier, and others were attempting to solve problems in language and orthography in quite the same spirit and manner that phoneticians and philologists are trying to apply at present; Bodin, L'Hospital, La Boétie and their co-workers sought to introduce new ideas and methods in government and politics; Rabelais and Montaigne and their disciples and rivals took up questions relating to education and science; Le Fèvre d'Etaples, Calvin (notwithstanding his later dogmatism) and many others turned to religion; and the list might be continued for other lines, such as art, architecture, medicine, astronomy, etc. "L'âge moderne et le siècle de Montaigne, de Pomponazzi, de Bruno, se peuvent rapprocher l'un de l'autre," says M. Charbonnel (p. D). Indeed, this was the century in which thought was to a great extent freed from the trammels that hampered its development in other periods—it was an epoch of transition, in which the vogue of old authorities was shattered, and new ones, whose establishment was largely due to the growth of absolutism, were not yet accepted. At no time in history was the intellectual relationship between France and neighboring countries so intimate, and this condition doubtless was at once the cause and the effect of the widespread interest in foreign travel.

Thanks to these pilgrims, most of whom were scholars, new currents of ideas penetrated into France.<sup>2</sup> And this "confluent," as M. Charbonnel aptly applies a term which is justified by the way in which neo-Platonism, mysticism, Petrarchism and even Aristotelianism became intermingled, served as a new "tournant," or

<sup>2</sup> For a list of Frenchmen who studied at the University of Ferrara in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, cf. Picot, *Etudiants français à l'Université de Ferrare* in the *Journal des Savants*, Feb., 1902. Naudé, an arch-libertine of the seventeenth century, took his doctoral degree at Padua in 1633.

point of departure, for a rejuvenation of thought. It is therefore obvious that the origins, as well as the principles, of classicism, which, according to M. Charbonnel, are still "mal systématisés," need, as a consequence of his investigations, further elucidation. Until recently even the overwhelming influence of Italy on the Renaissance in France had not been sufficiently appreciated.<sup>3</sup> The Libertine movement likewise, which has often been considered as confined to seventeenth-century France, extends its roots far back into the preceding period—most probably as far back as to the positive attitude assumed by the Church in favor of Thomism. It seems, as a matter of fact, to have been this dogmatic exclusiveness that stirred hostile thought.<sup>4</sup> Hence it will be necessary for us to modify to a great extent our acquiescence in the assumption of M. Strowski that the breviary of the Libertines in the seventeenth century was the *Sagesse* of Charron.<sup>5</sup> As stated above.

<sup>3</sup> Works by Picot, Villey, Vianey, Tilley, Renaudet, and others have contributed for the most part to a more just evaluation of the influence of France's southern neighbor.

<sup>4</sup> The reader's attention should be called to the somewhat unusual method of pagination adopted by M. Charbonnel. For example, to the end of the *Table des Matières*, Italic capitals (I-IX) are used. For the preface and bibliography Roman capitals (A-UU) have been adopted. In the appendices the ordinary Roman lettering (i-lxxxiv) has been selected.

A usual failing of French scholars to which M. Charbonnel also falls a victim is the tendency to distort English names and mis-spell English words. Thus, French scholars persist—for unknown reasons—in calling Mr. Christie, Mr. Copley Christie (p. DD); and the familiar name of McIntyre appears as Intyre (Mac) (p. SS). Furthermore, we find 'skeptis' on p. MM—but corrected on p. TT—in which one would possibly not recognize 'sceptics.' Nouns and adjectives of nationality are often not capitalized, as, e. g., *italian* (p. LL), etc.

It may also be noted that the author seems to have failed to explain the abbreviations used in the bibliography (pp. O-UU), which in other respects is most satisfactory. The only omissions found by the reviewer are Renaudet, *Préréforme et humanisme à Paris, pendant les premières guerres d'Italie*, Paris, 1916; ; A. Tilley, *The Dawn of the French Renaissance*, Cambridge, 1918; and Alma de L. Le Duc, *Gontier Col and the French Pre-Renaissance*, Lancaster, Pa., 1918. But it is quite possible that all of these works appeared after M. Charbonnel had completed his ms. In the reviewer's opinion, M. C. deserves credit for having emphasized the importance of the *Doctrine Curieuse* of Père Garasse. If judged in a negative way, it is valuable for its information regarding the different Libertine movements.

<sup>5</sup> In fact, the main weakness of M. Strowski's otherwise useful *Pascal et*

Libertinism goes even back of and beyond the paganism of the Pléiade. And, strangely enough, by its unswerving devotion to Aristotle, the Church encouraged the very forces which it was seeking to destroy.<sup>6</sup> In the sixteenth century a great impetus was given to the Libertine movement by the publication of the translation of the *Cortegiano* of Castiglione,<sup>7</sup> which, with the *Amadis de Gaule*, had such extraordinary influence on the development of social ideals in France. Furthermore, with the influx of Italians at the French court—due in the early period to Francis I and later on to Catherine de Médicis<sup>8</sup>—the diffusion of Libertine ideas was very great. La Noue, in his *Discours*, states that in 1585 there were one million atheists and unbelievers in France. In order to set forth clearly the ultimate sources of Libertinism, M. Charbonnel finds it desirable to give succinct résumés of the philosophy of Plato, Aristotle and the neo-Platonists, and then shows, as mentioned above, how all of these schools became more or less intermingled and confused at the time of the Renaissance (p. 160).

*son temps* (3 vols., Paris, 1907) consists in his tendency to arrive at definite and far-reaching conclusions from insufficient data—generalizations not seldom influenced by preconceived hypotheses, against which the reader must be carefully on his guard. Thus, M. Villey in his brilliant study entitled *Les Sources et l'évolution des Essais de Montaigne*, (Paris, 1908) has shown that M. Strowski was also wrong in insisting on the influence of Pico della Mirandola on Montaigne (cf. Strowski, *Montaigne et F. Pic de la Mirandole*, Bulletin italien, 1905; and *Montaigne*, Paris, 1906).

\*This may serve to explain why, in spite of the vigorous anti-scholasticism of the sixteenth century, Aristotle maintained his sway over the philosophy of the seventeenth century (cf. Charbonnel, pp. 38 and 48). Moreover, notwithstanding the almost universal condemnation of Machiavelli, the development of absolutism under Louis XIV—of which the sources may be found in the instruction of his tutor Mazarin—may also be due in large part to the cult of the Greek philosopher (p. 15).

<sup>7</sup>Translated by Jacques Colin d'Auxerre and edited by Mellin de Saint-Gelays in 1538. Cf. H.-J. Molinier, *Mellin de Saint-Gelays*, Rodez, 1910, pp. 145-148.

<sup>8</sup>It is interesting to note that, following Agrippa d'Aubigné, M. Charbonnel attributes the astuteness and cruelty of Catherine to the influence of Machiavelli (p. 34). But, as indicated above, it was through the popularity of Aristotle that Libertinism was fostered. So much so that whenever it was discovered that a heretic was an Aristotelian, no special objection was raised against him. In that respect M. Charbonnel quotes freely (pp. 80 et seq.) from a splendid appreciation of Aristotle by Silhon, one of the publicists of Richelieu, in his *De l'Immortalité de l'âme*.

Next follow (p. 160) expositions of the doctrines of Ibn-Roschd (1126-1198)—better known as Averroës, St. Thomas (p. 172), and the Astrologers (p. 192), after which the author makes it apparent (p. 244 et seq.) that the Church seemed to be disturbed only when the immortality of the soul was brought into question, for, on account of the prevalence of Epicureanism, this dogma was looked upon by theologians as the keystone of orthodoxy.<sup>9</sup>

In what may be considered the most important chapters of this volume, M. Charbonnel has revealed his critical acumen in stressing the influence of the brilliant, though erratic, Italian philosopher Lucilio Vanini (p. 302). It is quite true that in the *Histoire critique de la vie de Jules-César Vanini*,<sup>10</sup> M. Baudouin has given a careful estimate of the contribution of the Neapolitan to the history of philosophy, which after all is not important, but though he has been mentioned frequently by literary critics, no one seems to have attempted a clear statement of his influence on the cultural background of the seventeenth century. And yet there is little doubt that this popularizer did more to mould liberal thought than any other person of his time. In fact, to understand Gassendi and the Libertine movement, it is necessary to study Vanini, for, as we have already indicated, the wide acceptance of these doctrines was in a way a natural consequence of propaganda by Italians. One feels, therefore, that no student of this epoch, after reading M. Charbonnel's résumés and translations of the tracts of the brilliant Neapolitan, will fail to give him his just deserts.<sup>11</sup>

\* Thereby much of the seeming lack of consistency on the part of the Church—such as persecution of philosophers and scholars like Dolet and Ramus, while ardent Aristotelians and heretical poets were allowed to go scot free—becomes not only explicable but consequential. The course pursued by the Jesuits, which M. C. has analyzed so thoroughly (p. 273), falls in line with what is stated above.

<sup>9</sup> *Revue philosophique*, III, 1879; republished in one volume in 1903, and also reprinted in the *Revue des Pyrénées*, xv, 1903.

<sup>11</sup> A reading of Vanini's treatises helps us to understand why Aristotle continued to exercise undisputed sway over the theological philosophy of the seventeenth century (cf. p. 323). See also Vanini's theory regarding the immortality of the soul (p. 324). For Platonism in Vanini, cf. p. 336. M. Charbonnel deserves our thanks for having translated several of the important tracts of the Italian philosopher in view of the fact that his works are now difficult to obtain. For the same reason it is perhaps only right that the greatest amount of space should be allotted to an author who after all is merely a vulgarizer (86 pp.).

In regard to the frightful penalty inflicted upon Vanini, it may not be out of place to recall that his prosecutor was Guillaume de Catel, the justly celebrated historian of Toulouse.<sup>12</sup> Anent the conduct of the trial, the present reviewer may be justified in quoting a few lines from an article published by him a few years ago relating to a letter written by Catel to the renowned Peiresc:

"Les registres des Capitouls [of Toulouse] et les mémoires du temps, ainsi que ceux de nos jours, ont accusé le savant historien d'avoir mis une apreté indomptable à arracher au Parlement cet arrêt de condamnation. Pour expliquer ce prétendu acharnement, on a supposé une romanesque rivalité d'amour. On a même affirmé que Catel aurait voulu se venger de Vanini, et plusieurs savants auraient jugée digne de foi cette légende invraisemblable. Mais s'il y eut du parti pris de la part de Catel, ce n'est pas là qu'il faut en chercher les motifs. Dans un article sur le testament de Catel, Mgr. Douais a parlé avec éloge de 'la vraie bonté d'âme' dont l'historien fit preuve envers tous ceux qui l'entouraient, sa famille, ces amis et même ses domestiques. Les nombreuses donations faites par lui aux pauvres et aux institutions charitables de Toulouse établissent que sa foi était ardente et sincère. Or, ainsi que ses concitoyens, il a dû partager l'intolérance et les préjugés de son époque. A Toulouse, a-t-on dit, on n'a jamais cessé de poursuivre les incroyants et les athées. Cinq ans à peine avant le procès de Vanini, les collègues de Catel avaient condamné au même supplice le prêtre Jean Duval, accusé de magie. C'est plutôt donc du côté religieux qu'il faut nous tourner pour retrouver les motifs de la rigueur de Catel contre le Napolitain; et le postscriptum de la présente lettre nous paraît pouvoir servir d'appui à notre thèse."<sup>13</sup>

This brief postscript, containing the only mention ever made by Catel of his victim, shows that, notwithstanding his rôle as prosecutor, the learned historian and lawyer came under the spell of the brilliant Italian philosopher and was not sparing in words of praise for his erudition. One must not forget that Catel was unaware of the fact that Pompée Lucilio and Lucilio Vanini were one and the same person; and his brief remarks on this occasion have, therefore, even greater weight. The postscript reads as follows:

"Si ma lettre ne estoit si longue, je vous fairoes le discours d'un insigne athée, philosophe, et médecin, fils de Naples; lequel a esté sur mon raport par les deux chambres condamné et brulé. Il est mort athée, persévérant tousjours, le plus beau et le plus méchant esprit que je aye cogneu. Son nom estoet Pompée Lucilio."

Because of our general ignorance of the extensive Latin literature of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, we usually fail to take into consideration its important part in the history of French cul-

<sup>12</sup> He was the author of the *Histoire des contes de Tolose* (Toulouse, 1623, fol.), and the *Mémoires de l'histoire du Languedoc* (Toulouse, 1633, fol.).

<sup>13</sup> *Une lettre de Guillaume de Catel à Peiresc* in *Les Annales du Midi*, xviii, 1906, pp. 351-357.

ture. Practically all of the intellectual élite were skilled in Latin, to which vehicle, notwithstanding the somewhat verbose and futile declarations of Du Bellay, were consigned their most profound ideas. Hence by limiting our attention, as is customary, to French works alone, we miss what is probably most significant in the thought of the period. The vigorous and well-sustained logic of Vanini, as shown especially in the quotation on p. 352, is not only a splendid specimen of his style, but makes us regret our indifference—if we have been indifferent—to the work of these scholars. Furthermore, that we are dealing with a spirit totally at variance with that of the Church is obvious from the fact that these philosophers reject with scorn the idea of the “faibles d’esprit” so dear to the theologian, and acclaim loudly “la passion pour la gloire,” the dynamic principle of the Renaissance (p. 356).

Regarding Machiavelli, M. Charbonnel assumes the customary point of view, that his great work *Il Principe* was not intended as a satire but rather as a vigorous protestation against the debilitating influence of Catholicism.<sup>14</sup> Likewise the position occupied by Archimedes in the evolution of thought in these two centuries has been largely underestimated, although he was highly appreciated by scholars who, like Leonardo, were surfeited with the endless syllogisms of the scholastics. But more attention might have been accorded to Nicholas de Cusa (1401-1464). As the author of the *De Docta Ignorantia*, *De Visione Dei*, *De Concordantia Cathedræ*, he serves as a connecting link between the German mystics of the fourteenth century and the Italian neo-Platonists of the succeeding period, and thereby plays an important part in the promotion of independent thought.

Then follow succinct as well as comprehensive outlines of the philosophical ideas of Leonardo da Vinci and Giordano Bruno.<sup>15</sup> In regard to the latter we should not fail to note how greatly he was influenced by the neo-Platonism of his time—a fact that has not heretofore been emphasized (pp. 527-529).

<sup>14</sup> Cf. pp. 410 and 422. For his influence on political theory in modern Germany, see p. 435.

<sup>15</sup> The author supplies in the notes extensive translations and quotations from the original texts as well as other material, all of which enables the reader to make his own verifications and to control the conclusions presented.

Next in order may be found expositions of the fundamental principles of the philosophy of Kepler (p. 565), Galileo (p. 567) and Campanella (p. 574), in whose work also traces of neo-Platonism are manifest—a further testimony to the popularity of the author of the *Banquet*. In fact, if Aristotle was the patron saint of the scholastics, practically all of those outside the chosen circle came more or less under the spell of the exponent of love. Even the philosophy of the eighteenth century, notwithstanding its materialistic tendencies, is far more imbued with his doctrines than one is usually inclined to believe.<sup>16</sup>

After repeating (p. 703) that the *Pensées* of Pascal represent mainly a defense of Christianity against the insidious attacks of Libertinism, M. Charbonnel brings his masterly work to a close.<sup>17</sup>

In conclusion, if Libertinism assumed a decidedly transalpine character toward the close of the sixteenth century, a perusal of this work will show that it was not exotic to France. As a matter of fact, it was essentially Gallic—a heritage of the Middle Ages. Its immediate precursor—if that term may be used—was in all probability the *esprit narquois* of the *sotties* and *fabliaux* reappearing in the form of Lucianism during the closing years of the fifteenth century. But, unlike the authors of these works—for example Gringore—who by virtue of being regarded as defenders of the public weal, enjoyed great popularity, the Libertine, because he was not, as a general rule, animated by a lofty spirit, failed to win any large measure of esteem. And this was so true that even when he was a victim of atrocious punishment (as in the case of Vanini), his sad fate elicited little sympathy. Like the clever

<sup>16</sup> Cf. pp. 592-593. The reader is also referred to the résumés of the philosophy of Voltaire (p. 688), Diderot (p. 694) and the three Impostors (p. 696).

<sup>17</sup> There follow several excellent and carefully prepared appendices. It is to be regretted that in the one entitled *Relations intellectuelles entre l'Italie et la France* the author did not make greater use of the study by Emile Picot mentioned frequently above, as well as of the list of French authors and scholars who traveled in Italy in the early sixteenth century (published by M. H. Chamard in the *Revue des cours et conférences*, Paris, 1914, xxii, p. 527), which, though far from complete, is extremely useful.

Numerous omissions from the *Table onomastique* will greatly impair the usefulness of this study as a work of reference. So important a contribution should be made accessible to all by a fuller index as well as a more satisfactory *Table des matières*.

paragrapher of the present day who sacrifices everything to brilliance of wit, his criticism was negative and thereby, most frequently, destructive. Indeed, it was in the period when the spirit of vigorous protestation that animated the past was at its lowest ebb that Libertinism flourished most freely. Briefly, it may be characterized as a kind of decadent opposition to the outspreading and overtowering absolutism of the Church of the seventeenth century. It was a philosophical dilettanteism that had infected all the upper classes of society. During the course of the following century, when the somnolent populace began to re-assert itself, it was doomed to a gradual downfall.

JOHN L. GERIG.

*Columbia University.*

---

*Die Frauen rings um Friedrich Hebbel. Neue Materialien zu ihrer Erkenntnis. Mit einem Anhang: Aus Hebbels Freundeskreis. Von ALBRECHT JANSSEN. Hebbel-Forschungen VIII. Berlin-Leipzig, 1919. xi + 144 pp.*

Certainly the most striking part of this little book is the evidence it brings forward in support of the view that Friedrich Hebbel was the illegitimate son of a Pastor Volckmar, the same man to whom Werner refers as Volckmann, a popular version of the name. The editor of the series (*Hebbel-Forschungen*), while not considering the evidence compelling, does consider it worthy of attention. Even the author, though evidently much in love with his theory, does not claim to have established it conclusively.

Briefly the evidence is as follows. The rumor that Hebbel was Volckmar's son was generally current in Wesselburen from the poet's boyhood days on. After Bamberg came into possession of Hebbel's *Nachlass*, he wrote (1882) to Hugo Schlömer in Wesselburen, as a native of that place interested in founding a committee for the purpose of perpetuating the poet's memory, requesting him to find out what he could about Volckmar, "da angenommen werden müsse, dass dieser der natürliche Vater Hebbels gewesen sei." This letter from Bamberg was lost by the recipient, though his reply referring to the matter, dated 28. 8. 1882, is in Janssen's possession. The fact that Bamberg had dignified the "rumor" by his serious attention, though the investigation had no definite

results, encouraged Janssen, as he tells us, to make another and more determined effort.

Schlömer's grandparents came to Wesselburen in 1820. His grandfather, as *Armenarzt*, frequently treated the poet's mother, so also in her final illness. His grandmother told him in 1869 that Volckmar was Hebbel's father. Janssen found out a good deal about Volckmar, especially from church records. Volckmar, whose father was also a pastor, was born in Curau in 1766, graduated in theology in 1792, came (as *Diakonus*) to Wesselburen in 1797, where he died in 1814. He was a man of wide education, a good writer, brilliantly endowed in fact, but dissolute. He lost both first and second wife within three and one-half years, and in 1804 he took as a third wife his former servant girl, already the mother of two children. On this occasion he promised to receive and bring up these children as if they were his own, as they probably were. His general reputation was such that he was excluded from his pulpit for a time. Unfortunately the author does not tell us when this was. The truth of his hypothesis would involve the conclusion that the pastor remained incorrigible till the end.

The church records also furnished some information in regard to the poet's mother. Until 1875 it was the unvarying custom in Wesselburen to affix the word *Junggeselle* to the name of the man, and the word *Jungfrau* to the name of the girl in reporting a marriage between such persons. In this case the term *Junggeselle* is employed for the artisan Hebbel, but not the title *Jungfrau* for Antje Schubart. The author has official assurance that this is significant. Further, it is noted that the marriage took place in Wesselburen, and not in Wöhrden, where, however, the records show that both parties to the contract had lived several years prior to their engagement—a bit of new information the author brings out. Was this due to their fear of gossip in Wöhrden?

That the young wife of Claus Friedrich Hebbel had abundant opportunity to become acquainted with Volckmar after the removal to Wesselburen is evident from the fact that she worked out in the better families in the village.

As Janssen points out, the hypothesis, if true, would explain several things. First of all the sudden emergence of a genius in a family in which everyone else had been and remained on a low level of intelligence. Also it would account for the remarkable difference in type between Hebbel and his brother, who never rose higher

than his father. The author points out that Hebbel resembled neither his father nor his mother, was not in fact a peasant type at all. It might also explain why Friedrich was the object of his father's ill will and of his mother's special affection, although this could easily be explained by the boy's ambition to rise above the father's level.<sup>1</sup>

Where Bamberg got his idea, whether from the *Nachlass* or not, whether he destroyed what evidence he may have seen, whether Hebbel himself knew anything of such evidence, whether this may have been the reason he never returned to his native village—these questions the author asks to leave unanswered.

While this first chapter in Janssen's book is the most striking, it is not the most valuable. Those of us who attempt to get a clear picture of an author as a whole usually and naturally exhaust our energies on the outstanding problems of his life and productions. There are many minor issues that it seems either impossible or useless to follow up thoroughly. Here we rely willingly, too willingly perhaps, upon previous investigators, who may have had the same feeling about the matter. In this way gradually a false tradition arises. Such has been the case with Hebbel,<sup>2</sup> and it is Janssen's distinct service to have made a new examination of the records, in some cases the first and only examination, with the result that he is able in many instances to correct or supplement the best authorities on the poet. For example, he shows that it was Dethlefsen's wife rather than Dethlefsen himself who took the initiative in furthering Hebbel's education (p. 16). Also, relying on a letter from Hedde, he thinks it proper to date the beginning of Hebbel's poetic firstling (*Ringreiterfest*) back from 1829 to the summer of 1828 (p. 113).

The women discussed are Amalia Schoppe, Elise Lensing, and Christine Enghausen. The author presents the circumstances con-

<sup>1</sup> The author is generally fair in his argument. Hardly, however, in quoting the poet's *furchtbares Urteil* on his father—the well-known passage from the *Tagebuch*—omitting all reference to the milder conclusion of it.

<sup>2</sup> I keenly regret that this book reached me too late to prevent the continuation of a part of this false tradition in my own biography of Hebbel. The error in the date of Amalia Schoppe's death, 1851 for 1858, is to be sure not of that kind, being an unaccountable oversight; but for the dates of her editorship of the *Modespiegel*, 1827-1833 instead of 1827-1845, as Janssen asserts, p. 25, I relied on the *Allgemeine d. Biographie*.

necting them with Hebbel from their side, for a change, instead of from his. Particularly does he desire to vindicate the two former, and he is not in the least careful to shield Hebbel in the process. Rather the opposite. When we read the letters from Amalia Schoppe to a friend, published here (p. 26 f.) for the first time, we get an intimate view of an earnest and lovable personality, and we can easily agree with the author in deploring Kuh's somewhat supercilious characterization of the *sittenrichterliche Jugendschriftstellerin*, partial if true, or any other condescending treatment of a woman who meant so much in the poet's life. The author's conclusion, however, that she and Hebbel stood by nature in profound contrast to each other, is hardly more than could be inferred from the poet's presentation of the case. That she permitted Schoppe to drive her to marry him by a threat of suicide in case of refusal—again a new fact of Janssen's discovery—is enough to characterize her once and forever as incomprehensible to Hebbel. Also it can hardly be said that Janssen's defense of her against Hebbel's accusation of having forced him to sign a polemical article of her own writing is really a defense. That Hebbel exaggerated the importance of the occurrence may be true, but his was just the sort of nature to feel such an affront deeply.

Most interesting is the rounding out of the fate of this woman, so unhappy in her children, as well as the discussion of the final disposition of Hebbel's letters to her. Her son, Alphons, whom she followed to America after he had dishonored their name in Germany, refused to return the letters upon the poet's request after his mother's death, and replied, rather rudely, that he had destroyed them. The author is convinced that these letters included the early ones, though that does not seem to me conclusive from his argument. It is a pity that his presentation of this part of his material is not clearer.

Regarding Elise Lensing the author says: "Verleumdung und Zynismus haben ihr Bild beschmutzt; ich habe versucht, es rein zu waschen." He repels as totally unfounded and malicious Gutzkow's assertion that she was the cast-off mistress of a wealthy merchant at the time Hebbel met her, and denies that she had had a "past."<sup>3</sup> He establishes the place of her birth as Lenzen

<sup>3</sup> Hebbel, at any rate, does not seem to have been aware of any such state of affairs. Cf. *Briefe*, III, 6.

an der Elbe, Oct. 14, not Leezen in Schleswig-Holstein, Oct. 18, as in Werner. Likewise he sets himself, with success, the task of destroying the tradition that she was *eine ungebildete Näherin*, and proves that it is wrong to refer to her as a *seamstress* at all. The supposed *modiste's* shop she bought from Frau Baumgartner was in reality a tobacco store! And the author makes it plausible, from the nature of her associates in Hamburg, that she earned money by teaching, a profession for which she was properly equipped. The "von" he thinks was added to her name by Hebbel, in his somewhat characteristic desire to shine with titles.

Among the most successful passages in the book, it seems to me, is that on page 70 f., where the author presents Elise's case in opposition to Werner's biography, pp. 242 and 275. It was the time of Hebbel's indignation at her conduct in Hamburg (see esp. his letter of Dec. 16, 1844), when he reproached her for using his name as that of her husband. Janssen points out that practical conditions, such as difficulty in leasing rooms, forced this upon her, and also that she had long been assuming Hebbel's name with his knowledge and consent. Of course it is well known that he had already addressed letters to her as *Frau Doktor Hebbel*. Thus his indignation in that letter came rather late. In general the championship of her case here is so good as to render a defense of the poet difficult.

When a man's life lies before us as fully as Hebbel's in his letters and diaries, a minute examination of it will inevitably reveal many shortcomings. Who, when subjected to this test, his life surveyed as a whole from first to last, could come out unscarred? Certainly Hebbel does not. And it is not his marriage with Christine that weighs most heavily against him, for in that act lay too much of the grimness of necessity. Other things are less excusable. It seems to be true that in spite of the touching words upon the death of his little son, Max, he allowed him to be buried in a pauper's grave. So also with the second child, and, far worse yet, so too with Elise herself, and that at a time when his circumstances were much better. Is it not a mystery, how Hebbel (and Christine) could have allowed this to happen? And was it to spare *her* feelings, that she was kept strictly away from all company during her stay in Vienna, never making herself known by name to the most intimate friends of the family? Perhaps so.

Elise Lensing's letters to Hebbel were, as the author shows, in existence as late as 1896, when Christine, who had withheld them, promised to send them to the archives in Weimar. This promise was never kept, and Janssen supposes that they were destroyed to conceal some things that would have weighed heavily against the poet.

The chapter on Christine Enghausen describes the auspicious opening of her career as actress, and emphasizes particularly her untiring zeal in perpetuating the poet's memory and winning him proper recognition. She was fortunate in seeing these efforts crowned with success before her death in 1910.

The Appendix, *Aus Hebbel's Freundeskreis*, gives us welcome information concerning Hocker, Brede, and others, and particularly follows the fortunes of Leopold Alberti in America. The author quotes liberally from an article by Alberti in the *Hamburger Correspondent* (Aug., 1877), directed against certain statements in Kuh's biography. Following the lead given here, he makes it seem likely that the poem entitled *Nächtliches Echo* (*Werke*, v, 150) belongs essentially to Alberti and not to Hebbel. It was nothing for Alberti even to be proud of. Why Hebbel should have appropriated it is a mystery.

This little book is, in short, an important contribution to our knowledge of Hebbel. The author deserves full credit for discovering sources hitherto unthought of, and for presenting us the results of his painstaking investigation with refreshing brevity and directness. He has thrown new light on a number of interesting questions, he has exposed an imposing array of errors. Under the circumstances his noticeable satisfaction at being so often in a position to correct the redoubtable trio, Kuh, Werner, and Bornstein, is perhaps excusable.

T. M. CAMPBELL.

*Randolph-Macon Woman's College.*

---

*Ordo Rachelis*. By KARL YOUNG. [University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, No. 4.] Madison, 1919.

Of the four types of liturgical play connected with the Nativity, three, the *Officium Stellae*, the *Processus Prophetarum*, and the *Officium Pastorum*, have already been studied in considerable detail. Professor Young now undertakes to do for the *Ordo Rachelis*, or *Interfectio Puerorum*, what has been done for the Magi, the Prophets, and the Shepherds plays by Anz, Sepet, and Professor Young himself, respectively.

He first considers all the Epiphany plays in which a dramatic treatment of the *Interfectio* is latent, tracing the stages by which they approach to an actual dramatization of this theme. The four texts in which he finds the *Ordo Rachelis* developed as a true dramatic unit he carefully re-edits from the manuscripts, analyzing them at some length and indicating their sources in the Vulgate and the liturgy. In the concluding sections of the study, the relations between these four texts are investigated, the views of Anz and Meyer criticized, and the question whether the *Ordo Rachelis* arose as a mere extension of the *Officium Stellae* or as a dramatic unit which developed independently and was later appended to the Epiphany play is clearly stated, if not categorically answered.

Unfortunately, the four texts that have survived differ considerably in content and scope: the Limoges *Lamentatio* is a dramatic trope rather than a play; in the Laon text the *Interfectio* forms an integral part of an *Officium Stellae*; and in the two long plays from Fleury and Freising, although Professor Young is probably justified in regarding the *Ordo Rachelis* as "a separate dramatic unit" (p. 23), this theme is nevertheless so extended and developed as to include a *Fuga in Egyptum* and, in the case of the Freising play, scenes from the *Pastores* as well.<sup>1</sup> From these texts and from the Epiphany plays discussed on pp. 6-13, it becomes apparent that

<sup>1</sup> Chambers indeed believes (*Mediaeval Stage*, II, 49-50) that at Fleury and Freising the *Pastores*, *Stella* and *Rachel* have coalesced. He not only suggests that the Freising *Ordo Rachelis* may be intended to supplement rather than replace the Freising *Ordo Stellae*, but he finds it impossible to regard the Fleury *Interfectio Puerorum* as a separate play from the *Herodes*.

the dividing line between the *Officium Stellae* and the *Ordo Rachelis* cannot be definitely drawn: the Laon text with its relatively simple *Interfectio* is in many respects as closely related to the Compiègne and Freising plays as to the Limoges trope for Innocents Day. Professor Young's conclusion, therefore (p. 65), that the dramatic trope represented by the Limoges text arose as a separate creation, but that its use at the end of the *Officium Stellae* probably preceded its use as an independent play, seems to me both circumspect and convincing.

That the solution of the problem of provenience is facilitated by considering the Innocents scenes apart from their context will readily be granted. One wishes, however, that in attempting to establish the textual relations existing between the various versions, Professor Young had extended his comparisons beyond these scenes to the scenes in the Epiphany plays with which they are most frequently connected and to the *officia* of which, in three instances, they form a part. (On p. 49, note 64, some parallels are suggested, but their bearing on the textual interrelations is not discussed.) The similarities between the Fleury and Freising plays, for example, are far more extended than the likenesses between their *Interfectio* scenes would indicate,<sup>2</sup> and the fact that the Freising *Ordo Stellae* and the Fleury *Ordo Rachelis* alone substitute *Armiger* for *Indolis* in the verse *Indolis eximie pueros fac ense perire* seems at least significant (the Freising *Rachel* reads *Etatis bime*, all the other plays, *Indolis*).<sup>3</sup> Perhaps, too, the connections between the Fleury and Laon plays might have been further emphasized by a reference to the fact that the antiphon *Sinite parvulos* occurs in only two texts, those of Fleury and Compiègne, for the Compiègne text is in other respects closely related to the *Officium*

<sup>2</sup> The scenes preceding the *Interfectio* are conveniently compared in Davidson, *Studies in the English Mystery Plays*, pp. 50 ff. Note also the responsory *Aegypte, noli flere* used in the Flight scenes of both plays (Young, pp. 28, 49).

<sup>3</sup> The Freising *Ordo Stellae*, like the Fleury *Ordo Rachelis*, also keeps the prose *Decerne, Domine* which the Freising *Rachel* omits. These facts seem to me to lend some support to Chambers' hypothesis regarding the two Freising plays (see above, note 1). Both the Freising texts as well as the Fleury play have the Sallust tag (*Incendium meum*) which occurs elsewhere in only two texts, one from Strassburg and one from Einsiedeln. (Cf. Anz, p. 136.)

from the nearby cathedral of Laon. These are minor matters, however, and probably not calculated to shed much light upon those ecclesiastical relations that somehow produced similar liturgical plays in the cathedral of Freising near Munich and the ancient abbey of Fleury-Saint-Benoit on the Loire. Agreeing in general with Anz, though rightly rejecting his hypothetical reconstructions as well as Wm. Meyer's mythical German derivations, Professor Young concludes (p. 63): "we are sure of a French tradition that includes Limoges and Laon and of a German tradition that includes Freising; and in some manner the two traditions seem to be united in Fleury."

The painstaking scholarship characteristic of all Professor Young's illuminating contributions to the field of the liturgical drama is evident on every page of this study. An index of some sort, especially to the newly collated texts, would, one feels, have increased its usefulness, but in any case it lays students not only of the liturgical plays but of the mediæval drama generally under a heavy obligation to its author.

GRACE FRANK.

Baltimore, Md.

## CORRESPONDENCE

### NOTE ON SPENSER'S CLARION

The fabric of the *Muiopotmos* has sustained an activity of scholarship hard on a thing so fragile. Are we breaking this delicate butterfly unnecessarily upon the wheel, by over-complexity of conjecture? In the very name of Clarion, not yet satisfactorily explained, there may be a clue to simpler interpretation.

Mr. Long's suggestion<sup>1</sup> that Clarion is Spenser the lover in toils of a lady-Aragnoll, assumes, as Miss Lyon rightly thinks, a kind of compliment acceptable indeed as a sonnet-conceit but likely to be trying to a lady on so protracted a scale. Her own ingenious idea,<sup>2</sup> that Clarion is Raleigh in rivalry with Essex, still makes no allowance for the mock-heroic tone in this bright epic of the air, a tone which it is easy to feel with Mr. Nadal,<sup>3</sup> unless one has a thesis to prove. The older tradition,<sup>4</sup> that Clarion is in some sense

<sup>1</sup> *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, ix (1914), 457-462.

<sup>2</sup> *PMLA.*, xxxi (1916), 90-113.

<sup>3</sup> *PMLA.*, xxv (1910), 640, 656.

<sup>4</sup> James Russell Lowell, *N. Am. Rev.*, 1875, p. 365.

Spenser the poet, allows both the allegory and the mock-heroic. But Mr. Cory's variant from it,<sup>5</sup>—that *Muiopotmos* represents Spenser's tragedy of idealism, the fate of the dreamer, leaves us wondering even more why a dreamer should have so lively a name.

Spenser was used to speak of the "trumpets stern" as the instrument of his Muse. It may well be that in his search, not too solemn, for a mock-heroic subject, he meant by his Clarion, not his personal experience, nor, quite so subtly as Mr. Cory supposes, his idealism; but more literally his epic Muse, conceived again as a herald to trumpet forth the honor of the great, to glorify "the worthies" in "lofty verse."<sup>6</sup> For such a meaning the word Clarion would in Spenser's mind be very apt, if we judge by analogous lines in the complaint of Calliope, *Tears of the Muses*, 457-464:

Therefore the nurse of vertue I am hight,  
And golden Trompet of eternitie,  
That lowly thoughts lift up to heauens hight,  
And mortal men have power to deifie,  
Bacchus and Hercules I raised to heauen,  
And Charlemaine amongst the Starris seauen.

But now I will my golden Clarion rend,  
And will henceforth immortalize no more.

There is no likeness to the *Muiopotmos* situation in the later words of the Epic Muse. But here is epic poetry conceived as a "golden Clarion," as being indeed the "golden Trompet of eternitie" to honor mortal men.

The failure of such championship would have been in Spenser's mind especially at about this time, if Mr. Cory (Chapter II) is right that *Faerie Queene*, I-III, printed at so nearly the same time and representing a part of the Leicester support, reveals at its close the disillusion upon which Spenser is entering, his lost hope for his England and for what Leicester was to be for England. But it may be doubted if the immediate years after the Armada could be years of disillusion for a man of affairs like Spenser. And it is better not to take *Muiopotmos* too seriously. For a mock-heroic, a frown of the "rugged brow" or a check to the pension in 1590<sup>7</sup> would be sufficient to make of Burleigh a temporary Aragnoll.

ANNE KIMBALL TUELL.

Wellesley College.

<sup>5</sup> *Edmund Spenser, a Critical Study*, University of California Press, 1917, pp. 187-189.

<sup>6</sup> See *Shepheards Calendar*, October, ll. 61-66.

<sup>7</sup> See Percy E. Long, *Engl. Stud.*, XLVII (1913), 202.

## THE LOST QUIRES OF A SHIRLEY CODEX

In the course of revising and re-aligning notes on English manuscripts, I have observed some points of interest, especially with regard to the now well-known Shirley codex at Trinity College, Cambridge, marked R, 3, 20. On my first examination of this volume, more than twenty years ago, I stumbled upon the supposedly non-existent mummings by Lydgate, and printed the most striking of them in *Anglia*, vol. 22, for the year 1899. Most of the entries of the manuscript are now in print. Dr. Rudolf Brotanek published the other mummings in *Die englischen Maskenspiele* three years later, and in his remarks there on the codex, says that there is at its close a poem by its first possessor, entitled "The Kalundare of John Shirley," which gives important information as to Lydgate and his works.

Such a poem does not exist in R, 3, 20 today, however. But it exists in Brit. Mus. Add. 29729, a volume compiled by John Stow from "Master Blomfelds boke," "Master Hanlays boke," "Master Stantons boke," etc., and with forty or more of its pages filled with copies from "John Shirleys boke." That this Shirley book was the Trinity R, 3, 20 codex is evident from the agreement of all Stow's Shirley-items with poems in the Trinity volume, and from the marginal notes by Stow in R, 3, 20, showing that it was at one time in his hands. The mummings are among Stow's copies, also the *Life of St. Margaret*, of which neither this transcription nor its original is mentioned by MacCracken in his Lydgate Canon; the only poem of the many selections which Stow marks as from Shirley and which is not now in the codex is his copy, at the end of these excerpts, of the table of contents or "Kalundare,"—104 lines in short couplets. He expressly says that Shirley set the poem "in the beginning of his book"; Brotanek, probably thinking of its position in Add. 29729, speaks of "at the close."

The Trinity MS., as remarked, does not now contain the "Kalundare." But though not apparently defective at the beginning, it lacks the first thirteen gatherings; see Dr. James' description in his Catalogue, vol. II. And from this same "Kalundare," in Stow's transcription, we know what those gatherings contained; for lines 21 and 22 read

ffirst ye humayne / pilgrymage  
sayd all by proose in fayr langage.

As Shirley explicitly says "all by prose," we might dismiss the conjecture that this could have been Lydgate's translation, which is in verse, and believe that the lost text was more like the prose "Pilgrimage of the Lyfe of the Manhode," existing e. g. in Ff v, 30 of the University Library, Cambridge, and edited thence by William Aldis Wright for the Roxburghe Club in 1869. This work

fills 204 quarto pages of print, and R, 3, 20 lacks presumably 104 leaves, or 208 pages. But later in the "Kalundare" Shirley says of Lydgate that he

aught well be solempnyssed  
Of all oure engelische nacion  
ffor his famus / translacyon  
Of this booke and of other mo.

It would be straining probability to argue that Shirley means a translation of the *Pèlerinage* by Lydgate other than that he here transcribes; yet, are we to believe in a prose version by Lydgate alongside his bulky verse-rendering?

We can understand why Stow should pass by the continuous prose of the Pilgrimage to transcribe the brief occasional poems of the latter half of R, 3, 20; the rimed table of contents at the beginning caught his fancy, and he appended it to his group of selections, thereby preserving a record of what filled most, if not all, of the missing thirteen gatherings. This "Kalundare" in Stow's copy, the original Shirley "Kalundare" of Brit. Mus. Add. 16165, and various bits showing Shirley's work as a publicist will be printed in my volume *From Gower to Surrey*, now nearing completion. Shirley's limited though eager activity had no such effect on his time and on later times as had the work of the great translator-printer Caxton; but he was an editor in a small way, a sort of lesser—very much lesser—Frederick James Furnivall, whom he resembles in his indefatigable zeal for Chaucer and for Lydgate, his interest in his chosen work, and in the cheerful personal directness of his "forewords" addressed to an earlier English Text Society, the nobles and gentles to whom he lent his books.

ELEANOR PRESCOTT HAMMOND.

Boston.

---

#### MAUPASSANT'S VERSION OF *Les Deux Amantz*

Folk-lorists are well aware that the lay of Marie de France, *Les Dous Amantz*, is still told in various forms among the peasants of Normandy. The mountain up which the gallant young lover carried his sweetheart is still shown, and flowers, sprung according to Marie from the spilling of the magic potion and unknown to the surrounding country, are said to be found there. The best-known version in modern French literature is that of Ducis, *La Côte des Deux Amants*. (*Oeuvres*, Paris, 1826, III, 335 ff.) He obtained his information in 1812 while visiting Mme Gueroult and Mme Hauguet, wife and sister-in-law of the proprietor of the Château des Deux Amants. In a *Notice historique* Ducis quotes from a letter of Mme Hauguet which gives the legend as they knew it. "Les lumières . . . ne sont puisées que dans la tradition du pays,

et quelques notices de Darnaud, de Saint-Foix et de Madame de Genlis, toutes restreintes et de même nature. Le vieux château de la vallée d'Andelle était occupé par un seigneur de Pont-Saint-Pierre, contemporain de Charlemagne. Sa fille, nommée Caliste, jeune et belle, fut aimée et devint éprise d'un jeune paysan, nommé Edmond, serf de son père. Ce père, pour désespérer leur amour, imagina de mettre à son consentement une condition impossible. Il promit qu'il lui donnerait sa fille, s'il pouvait la porter de suite et sans aucun repos jusqu'au haut de la côte qui règne sur le château et toute la vallée d'Andelle, et la déposer sur son sommet, quoiqu'il fût regardé comme inaccessible. Le jeune homme, par une force et un courage incroyables, arrive au sommet, y dépose sa conquête, penche la tête, fixe des yeux pleins d'amour sur elle, et tombe mort de fatigue. Son amante meurt à l'instant de douleur. Tel est le fond de l'histoire. Le père, trop tard attendri et repentant, fit ériger par la suite le prieuré des Deux Amants au haut de cette côte; mais il fit enfermer les deux corps dans un même cercueil, et les fit transporter dans la chapelle la plus voisine, dépendante du monastère de Fontaine-Guerare."

The most important change from the lai of Marie is the transformation of the lover into a serf. Durdan suggests that this may have come from a misunderstanding of one of the terms by which Marie designates the youth: *vaslez*, which was taken to mean valet, domestic, and so serf. Ducis has added some details of his own invention so that the lai is almost unrecognizable in his version.<sup>1</sup>

In all the versions which I have found, it is the lover's task to carry the lady. But Maupassant, in his novel *Notre Coeur*,<sup>2</sup> alludes to a form of the story which is less familiar. He is reporting the soliloquy of a lover, wounded by the coldness of his mistress. "Le souvenir d'une vieille histoire lui vint, dont on a fait une légende: celle de la Côte des deux amants, qu'on voit en allant à Rouen. Une jeune fille obéissant au caprice cruel de son père, qui lui défendit d'épouser son amant si elle ne parvenait à le porter elle-même au sommet de la rude montagne, l'y traîna, marchant sur les mains et sur les genoux, et mourut en arrivant." And he concludes: "L'amour n'est donc plus qu'une légende, faite pour être chantée en vers ou contée en des romans trompeurs."

There is obviously no reason to suppose that Maupassant knew either the lai of Marie nor the poem of Ducis. He had doubtless heard some form of the popular legend from his Norman peasant friends. The interesting question is whether he has merely confused the rôle of the lovers, intentionally changed it, or heard the variant which he gives.

BENJ. M. WOODBRIDGE.

University of Texas.

<sup>1</sup> For modern versions of the story, see Warnke's edition of the *Lais*, Halle, 1900, and A. L. Durdan, *Le Lai des Deux Amants*, Macon, 1907.

<sup>2</sup> Paris, Ollendorff, 1890, p. 208.

A NOTE ON *King Lear*

In his discussion of the character of King Lear, Professor Bradley<sup>1</sup> says, "And, finally, though he is killed by an agony of pain, the agony in which he actually dies is one not of pain but of ecstasy." Assuming the truth of this statement, as indeed one must, we should do well to examine Lear's last words to discover, if we can, what causes the joy. This is the final speech:

And my poor fool is hang'd. No, no, no life!  
 Why should a dog, a horse, a rat, have life,  
 And thou no breath at all? Thou'lt come no more,  
 Never, never, never, never, never!  
 Pray you, undo this button: thank you, sir.  
 Do you see this? Look on her, look, her lips,  
 Look there, look there!

Obviously Lear thinks that Cordelia is being revived, that she is alive. Nothing could give him such an impression but the feather or the glass with which he had been vainly experimenting. Certainly the feather did not move, and certainly no mist stained the glass. How, then, can we explain the illusion? Is it not possible that his eyes tremble and grow dim at this last moment and that he thinks that the feather has stirred? Or, if it is the glass that he is still holding in his hand (I can find no evidence as to which he is using), may not the mist filming his own eyes be that which he imagines he sees on the glass? We have evidence as to Lear's eyesight. In the interval between his entrance with Cordelia's body and his death (55 lines) there are four references to his feeble vision: "Had I your tongues and eyes," line 259; "This feather stirs! she lives!" line 266; "Mine eyes are not o' the best," line 280; and "This is a dull sight," line 283. It therefore seems possible, if not probable, that Shakespeare attempted to emphasize Lear's failing sight in order to have at hand a ready explanation for the self-deception apparent in his last words.

ANTON A. RAVEN.

Dartmouth College.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Shakespearean Tragedy*, p. 291.

## BRIEF MENTION

*The Poems of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey.* By Frederick Morgan Padelford (University of Washington Publications: Language and Literature, vol. 1. Seattle, 1920). The *raison d'être* of this book is so well expressed by Professor Padelford that one must be pardoned for quoting the paragraph in full. "It is now rather more than a century since George Frederick Nott published his elaborate edition of the works of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey. Since then no scholarly edition has been attempted. During this time, however, many facts bearing upon the career of Surrey have come to light, a noteworthy biography has been published, studies dealing with various phases of the poetry have appeared, and manuscript versions of many of the lyrics and two fresh texts of the fourth book of the *Æneid* have been discovered. The time therefore seems ripe for a new edition that will take advantage of this fresh knowledge, giving more authoritative readings in the poems and furnishing the equipment needed by the scholar. The present volume aims to meet this need." Nothing can be said against this program. Professor Padelford's purpose is justified by the reported facts and circumstances.

It is not an equally simple matter to pass judgment on the execution of this purpose. Having in mind Professor Padelford's trustworthy scholarship, and his constructive skill, one is predisposed to pass a favorable judgement on every feature of this work. But after an effort to construe all 'findings' favorably, there remains the conviction that he has compelled his colleagues to ask a number of questions that reflect aspects of disappointment. The form of the publication, of course, suggests an application of the law of the "kinds." Conventionally an academic monograph is not governed by the structural principles of a book. Altho yielding to the desirability of starting a new series of University Publications, Professor Padelford's prefatory statements indicate that he has had in mind the making of a 'book,' "published to the common profit and delectation of the many," rather than a monograph for the use of specialists. He has produced a scholarly edition of Surrey's poems which will take its place by the side of Foxwell's edition of *The Poems of Sir Thomas Wyatt* in critical value, but the difference between his "Critical Notes" and Foxwell's "Commentary" is rather unfavorable to the general usefulness of his work.

Professor Padelford had a goodly share in the preliminary investigations for making accessible the texts of Surrey's compositions in the most authentic form. In respect, therefore, of this feature this "new edition" has a value and significance of first-

class order. But editorially, or in the matter of planning a book, all has not been done to facilitate the use of this new material. Helpful would have been a tabulation of the poems with reference to manuscripts and printed books, giving a view of the textual sources and traditions, which is left to be gained by a sifting of the Textual Notes and the Bibliography. At all events one feels that the facts under this head might have been presented in a fashion to require less effort of the reader in bringing together separated passages. For example, what is to be noted respecting the occurrence of No. 38 in MS. *E*. is not indicated on p. 173, but on p. 219 (where, however, the number is misprinted 39). Similarly with No. 21; the statement on p. 171, "Found also in *D*," does not suggest the fact recorded on pp. 186, 219; and what is said of No. 21 in connection with *Harl.* on p. 219 is not confirmed on p. 186, nor is it in agreement with *Anglia* XXIX, 273. Moreover, the specific designation by numerals (p. 219) of the poems in *Harl.* and also of those in *D.* and *E.* makes conspicuous the lack of the corresponding designation of the three poems in *Hill*; and in lieu of the suggested tabulation, the twenty-eight poems of *P.* and the eighteen of *A.* should also have been numbered. Another detail may be added to show how difficult it will be for the studious reader to find the desired information on a particular point. Where is he to find a statement of what constitutes the manuscript or printed basis of the *Aeneid* II? Is he to make the inference from "Certain Bookes" on p. 220; or turn to *The Mod. Lang. Review*, xiv, 164, or elsewhere?

Professor Padelford has had the advantage of availing himself of the opportune moment for an attractive task. That attractiveness is surely due in good measure to the privilege of presenting the results of a number of special investigations. The degree of satisfaction with which the investigator observes the report and incorporation of his work must be a test of how the reporter has done his work. Let this test be applied to the critical note (pp. 200-201) in which is summarized what is known or conjectured concerning *Aeneid* II. Now, should one expect Dr. Dittes to be quite content not to be mentioned in this connection? And does the rather incidental occurrence of the names Imelmann and Fest serve to give the reader a just estimate of what these scholars have contributed to the subject? Also in the critical introduction to *Aeneid* IV, there is not offered the desired well-constructed report of the several important investigations listed in the Bibliography. Besides, there is here a striking disproportion in the allotment of space to the different sides of the subject. Especially disproportionate is the space devoted to the evidence of certain grammatical features and metrical details. Unfortunately the grammatical forms, in this instance, are of little consequence as evidence; and the metrical details are misinterpreted. Amends for all this, how-

ever, Professor Padelford has made in supplying a most desirable edition of the text of *Aeneid* iv. The Tottle and the Hargrave texts are printed side by side and the readings of the only extant copy of *D* are exhibited in collected form on the basis of Tottle. The three sixteenth century 'versions' are thus with scrupulous accuracy made accessible for further study.

By no easily drawn inference from the prevailing character of the "Critical Notes" is Professor Padelford's exact purpose made obvious; one cannot with certainty describe the particular class of readers he has had in mind. Notes interpretative of thought and figure are either too meagre or altogether wanting to attract and instruct the more general reader; and the scholar too will look in vain for a satisfactory indication of what has been accumulating in this department of study. It would be unfair to require the compiler of a commentary to report with uniform minuteness all preceding interpretative suggestions; yet there is a tribute to be paid to precedence in time that is usually well deserved. Thus, to take a simple example, altho the comment on No. 4 is interpretative in the desired sense, why should not a reference be made to Dr. H. Nagel, who in 1889 also placed the three texts before the reader and added a discriminating comparison of the methods of Surrey and Wyatt? And Professor Padelford, who so well appreciates the helpfulness of a well constructed critical apparatus of study, would certainly have gratified his colleagues by supplying all references to show in detail how the recorded judgments and observations have been arrived at. Dr. Koeppel gave the clue to the method one has in mind in this connection. He listed what Nott had noted with respect to sources, and then proceeded to his own additions and modifications. No commentator should do less than apply this method when dealing with the study of Surrey's poems, which is marked by definite stages of progress. That Professor Padelford has put the reader and student to a disadvantage by not observing this method as consistently as possible may be seen by turning to the notes on No. 15 (p. 185), where the first note is due to Nott and the second to Koeppel (p. 85). Comparison of notes on No. 11 (p. 182) and the editor's *Early Sixteenth Century Lyrics*, p. 130, suggests the question, Why have the designations "(N.)" and "(K.)" been cancelled. Details of this class may appear to be too unimportant to sustain the weight of serious criticism; but Professor Padelford will not regard them in that light, for it is obvious that he has had a pattern in mind that has led him, without his conscious consent, beyond the limits of approved conciseness.

As a whole the critical notes on the *Aeneid* represent careful and efficient consideration of the various classes of pertinent details. But one must regret the absence of a philosophic discussion of the cultural aspects of Surrey's indebtedness to preceding translations.

As to the order in which the two books were translated, the editor is 'inclined to think' that the second book preceded the fourth; but so far as this conclusion (perhaps expressed with too much caution) is based on metrical features it is not undeniably strengthened. In this division of the argument, as also in that which relates to the comparison of the three forms of the fourth book, metrical details are not well handled. There is a fundamental error here, that is easily detected in the statement that Surrey intended "a judicious interspersion of trochees and other feet" (p. 207), and in the use of the descriptives anapests and amphibrachs. The permissible resolution of arsis or thesis corrects the misunderstanding of the rhythm. And it should be clear that there is a misleading use of terms that properly describe a mere sequence of syllables and not a possible rhythmic or structural foot. The (Alexandrian) amphibrach is one of these non-structural forms, so is the amphimacer, and the pyrrhic, and the tribrach. Dionysius of Halicarnassus declared the rhythmic quality of the amphibrach to be specious; and the simplest law of rhythm should have diverted Skeat from the attempt to prove its structural use, and have convinced Mr. Omond that "our metrists" have "some reason" for not recognizing it as an English foot (*A Study of Metre*, p. 94).

The Introduction consists of "The Dramatic Career of Surrey" (pp. 7-36), and "Surrey's Contribution to English Verse" (pp. 37-42), two chapters unequal in length and differing widely in value. The titular use of the term dramatic is appropriately descriptive of the poet's short and eventful career, which Professor Padelford has sketched in a finely sympathetic and effective manner. What is here done must leave little more to be done in the tracing of the relation between the series of public and political events and that of the influences and circumstances of the poet's literary activities. In the second of these introductory chapters one finds less that is complete. Wyatt and Surrey as poets are compared, but in terms that are for the most part too general; and Surrey's "contribution to English verse" is considered chiefly with reference to the external forms of poetry, and with insufficient critical analysis of his poetic art as a whole.

This publication represents an excellent preparation for a handy and well-made book to take the place of the Aldine edition, and Professor Padelford's colleagues must surely be of one mind in hoping that he will proceed to supply that demand.

J. W. B.

English and American teachers who prefer an abbreviated and expurgated Rabelais to the unadulterated text will welcome *Readings from Rabelais* by the late W. F. Smith, recently published at the Cambridge University Press. Known by a translation of Rabelais, by articles in *R. E. R.* and *M. L. R.*, and by *Rabelais in His Writings* (Cambridge, 1918), he was well qualified to make this edition. The selections include about a fourth of Rabelais's chapters. Brief summaries of the others are added. All four books are represented, most largely *Gargantua* and the *Quart Livre*. While most of the chapters given are essential to an understanding of the author, I miss the prologue to *Gargantua*, the brilliant *Propos des beuveurs*, far more important to a student of style than the giants' Ciceronian correspondence, the speech of Janotus de Bragmardo, Panurge's talk about debtors and creditors, the interviews with Trouillogan and Judge Bridoye, and the account of the storm in the *Quart Livre*. Still more regrettable is the fact that Mr. Smith found it necessary to expurgate his text so extensively. In so doing he prevents a full appreciation of Rabelais's curiosity, humor, and gift of expression. He loses much of the *sustantifique mouelle* we are invited to enjoy. Occasionally, too, the reader is misled as to the meaning of the passage. Thus *eulx retornans* (p. 9) makes no sense because the fact that Gargantua has gone "es lieux secrets" has been modestly omitted. Again *le* (p. 136, ll. 10, 11) cannot be understood, for the noun to which it refers has been removed.

Except where such devotion to *bonnes mœurs* has interfered, the text has been carefully reproduced after the editions of Abel Lefranc, Jouaust, and Marty-Laveaux. The notes are, in the main, satisfactory, but a glossary is still needed for the student who is beginning his acquaintance with sixteenth-century forms and vocabulary. While waiting for the completion of M. Lefranc's edition of Rabelais, scholars may consult with profit Mr. Smith's notes, particularly for information with regard to Rabelais's sources, nearly all of which he thought he had determined. The edition is accompanied by an adequate account of Rabelais's life, with no attempt, unfortunately, at literary criticism, by an appendix on the educational system which Rabelais combated and another on J. E. Sandys and Mr. Arthur Tilley.

H. C. L.

---